Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

# THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. XXIV.

# List of Contributors to Volume XXIV

Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. A. E. Baker, M.A.
Rev. W. Ernest Beet, Litt.D., F.R.Hist.S.
Rev. Canon G. H. Box, M.A., D.D.
Professor Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D.
Rev. James Robertson Cameron, M.A., D.Phil.
Professor W. A. Craigie, LL.D., Litt.D.
Rev. J. M. Creed, M.A.
Rev. Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D.
Rev. George Edmundson, D.Litt.
Rev. Professor J. W. Falconer, D.D.
Rev. A. Fawkes, M.A.
Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A.
H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D.
Professor Rendel Harris, LL.D., Litt.D.
Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.
Rev. Professor J. A. Kelso, Ph.D., D.D.
Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D.
Rev. Professor W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.
Rev. Innes Logan, M.A.
Rev. G. H. C. MacGregor, M.A.
Rev. Professor John R. Mackay, M.A.
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
Rev. A. D. Martin, M.A.
Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. J. R. Mozley, M.A.
Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Professor J. A. Robertson, M.A., D.D.
Edith Anne Robertson.
Rev. Hunter Smith, M.A.
Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.

# THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL,
C.H., D.D., LL.D.

*EIGHTH SERIES*

Volume XXIV

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXXII

*Printed in Great Britain*
*by* Butler & Tanner
*Frome and London*

1922:2

## *ST. LUKE AND LITERARY CRITICISM.*

THE vital and varied attention which has been paid of late to Luke's writings raises some fundamental principles of literary criticism. Luke, apart from the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, is termed by Professor J. H. Moulton "the only littérateur among the authors of New Testament books; . . . Luke, as a Greek, fell by a native instinct into the habit of style which would make his narrative tell!"[1] This characteristic came out primarily in the third gospel, where we can often contrast his way of reporting a story or of repeating a saying with those of Matthew and of Mark. Not that the two latter are not telling in their own way. But Luke, we feel, is more conscious of his methods, more attentive to minutiæ of diction, and this suggests one aspect of his gospel as compared with that of Matthew; Luke's style is a written style rather than a spoken style. The distinction between these two styles in literature is hard to find, but it is real. In Matthew's version of the sayings of Jesus, for example, we frequently hear the true teacher, who writes to have his hearers catch and recollect what he is saying; there are places where this tendency comes out distinctly in the arrangement and the style. Whereas Luke writes to be read; the bookman appears as well as the reporter or the catechist.

[1] *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. ii. part i. (1919), p. 7. He observes, on p. 9, that "Luke's knowledge of Greek literature does not seem to have gone far beyond the medical writers who so profoundly influenced his diction." I quote this for the latter part of the sentence, not for the first.

I do not deny that he is often effective and artistic, sometimes memorable in his way of putting a thing. Yet we feel that upon the whole his style reflects less vividly the original talk and teaching of Jesus ; it tends to be more Greek and literary. This is a criterion which ought to be borne in mind as we reconstruct Q, for example. It is one of the really important principles in the literary criticism of the third gospel.

What I wish to do in the present paper, however, is to examine some of the contentions in Mr. H. J. Cadbury's monograph on *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Harvard University Press). This appears in two parts. The second, upon Luke's use of his sources, i.e. of Mark's gospel especially, requires no special comment ; the linguistic data have been already arranged by Wernle and Nicolardot, in our own day, but it is convenient to have them presented in English with accuracy and sufficient completeness, since neither Scholten nor W. Schmid is accessible to the majority of English students. That Luke often re-wrote or altered the language of his predecessors is obvious. Why he did so is another and more subtle problem, which Mr. Cadbury wisely chooses now and then to leave unsolved. It is the first part of the monograph which is really important, that upon the diction of the third gospel and of Acts. The second, which occupies pp. 73–205, and forms a welcome, sensible sketch of the phenomena, only calls for notice in some details. On p. 98, for example, Mr. Cadbury notes, though he does not attempt to explain, the change in the order of the first four disciples' names ; in Mark (iii. 16 f.) it is—Simon called Peter, James and John, then Andrew ; in Luke it is—Simon and Andrew, then James and John just as in Matthew. Probably Mark put first the disciples who received new names from Jesus, while the ordinary order put Andrew next his brother. The next item of this kind of

alteration, chronicled by Mr. Cadbury, is a mistake; he quotes Mark xiv. 71 (Peter began to curse and swear) and contrasts "Luke xxii. 59 *ἄλλος τις* (not Peter) *διϊσχυρίζετο*"; but, of course, the latter passage refers not to a disciple, but to a suspicious questioner in the group gathered beside the fire.[1] On p. 102 is it quite accurate to say that "in Luke xx. 40 we are told that the scribes no longer (*οὐκέτι*,, so Mark xii. 34) dared ask him any question"? Luke simply says *οὐκέτι ἐτόλμων*, without mentioning scribes at all. The *οὐκέτι κτλ.* sentence rounds off only two questions of the Pharisees and Sadducees in Luke, instead of three, as in Mark, or four, as in Matthew; it is not correct, therefore, to say that "the *οὐκέτι* has no real meaning in Luke." Again, while it is true that *ἐκεφαλίωσαν* in Mark xii. 4 only occurs here in Greek literature, is it not likely that it is really a palæographical error for *ἐκολάφισαν*, as Professor Burkitt has suggested (*Journal of Theological Studies*, 1911, pp. 173 f.)? On p. 202, in noting how *νηστεύσας* in Matthew's version of the temptation narrative answers to Luke's *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*, he adds that "probably Luke is not changing, but merely retaining the original *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*." This agrees with Professor Moulton's (EXPOSITOR, 1909, p. 415) argument against Harnack on the phrase. I doubt if it was of much value to note a minor detail like the occasional avoidance of *ἔμπροσθεν* (p. 204), for *ἔμπροσθεν* is not avoided usually by Luke, and, for some reason or other, its equivalent *ἐνώπιον* is never used by Mark or by Matthew.

The first part (pp. 1–72) calls for closer scrutiny. In it Mr. Cadbury returns to the theory that there is no evidence for "medical" language in the Lucan writings, and that

[1] The next section notes a characteristic which is not new, but which is none the worse of being recalled, viz., that "an unusual expression in Luke may have been suggested by reminiscence of its occurrence in a neighbouring context in Mark."

therefore "the so-called medical language of these books cannot be used as a proof that Luke was their author, nor even as an argument confirming the tradition of his authorship" (p. 51). He makes occasionally some fair criticism of his opponents. Thus, I admit I ought not to have included *ἐπιπίπτειν* (Acts xiii. 11) in my list of "medical" terms, since, although it is a good Lucan term, the MSS. evidence for it in this passage lies open to challenge. Similarly it is quite legitimate to point out that Sir W. M. Ramsay is wrong when he claims [1] that "in Luke viii. 55 the physician mentions that Jairus' daughter called for food," the truth being, of course, that it was Jesus who called for food to be given her, and that this is chronicled by Mark as well as by Luke. Also, Hobart was in error when he said that *εὐφορέω* (Luke xii. 16) = "be fruitful" was only used by Hippocrates, Luke, and Galen. But the general thesis defended by Mr. Cadbury I find unsatisfactory; at any rate, if the view which holds that there is adequate evidence for "medical" or pathological terminology in Luke has to be given up, it will not be on account of the arguments adduced in this monograph. It is a small problem of literary or of linguistic criticism, but it is important enough to deserve some attention still.

Thumb once referred to the problem in somewhat misleading terms. "That Luke uses a series of medical expressions which are to be found in Hippocrates and other physicians does not prove that he studied medical writings but, at most, that he was acquainted with the ordinary medical terminology."[2] The real argument is cumulative, that Luke, "the beloved physician" and friend of Paul, wrote the third gospel and its sequel, and that this particular trait of his style is consonant with the tradition. Or, that the tradition is

[1] *Luke the Physician*, p. 58.
[2] *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, p. 226.

corroborated by the trait. It is not as if we were dealing with some utterly unknown "Luke." The question requires to be stated carefully. It is this: not whether Luke employs a definitely "medical" vocabulary—for it is unlikely that there was one—nor that he shows traces of having studied the writings attributed to Hippocrates, but whether there are not sufficient data, in the comparative study of the synoptic gospels, primarily, to justify us in regarding his style and diction as harmonising with the tradition that he was a physician. Atticists of the period are known to have been acquainted with the Hippocratean books.[1] These writings were studied by all manner of non-medical writers. To some extent the so-called "medical" language was simply part and parcel of the higher culture of the age; non-professional people like Polybius, Seneca, Lucian, and even Philo might well employ such terms occasionally, without being suspected of having practised medicine as a livelihood. But when we find, as we do find, for example, three primitive Christian writers telling the same stories and recording the same sayings, and one of them repeatedly having recourse to "medical" terms of expression; and when, independently, we know there is reason to suppose provisionally that this author was a physician; it is fair to argue that the diction may be used to corroborate the tradition, and that in this case it is not enough to regard such terms of expression, either in the third gospel or in its sequel, as merely due to the higher culture of the period at which the author wrote. The case is not the same as that of Seneca, or Polybius, or Lucian. There is the danger, familiar to literary criticism, of reading too much into these linguistic phenomena—the danger illustrated by the hypo-

[1] Their origin and authenticity do not matter, in this connexion. "Until Galen wrote a certain lost treatise on the authenticity of the several works of the Corpus, no one bothered his head as to who wrote 'Hippocrates'" (Sir Clifford Allbutt, *Greek Medicine in Rome*, p. 275).

thesis, for example, that Shakespeare was a lawyer because alleged "legal" allusions are so frequent in some of his plays. Plausible arguments of this kind resemble Mr. Cadbury's proof [1] that Lucian might be considered a "medical," on the score of his language. But the parallel between Lucian and Luke is illegitimate. Lucian dipped widely into the current interests and topics of his day. As a pleader and a sophist he picked up—he had to pick up—all manner of casual knowledge for his lectures, and he had a range of literature at his command for purposes of composition and lectures which has no parallel in Luke. Part of our delight in reading Lucian is to feel how versatile he is in subjects and in style. It would be almost as easy to prove Lucian a sailor or a physician as to show that Shakespeare was a lawyer or a papist, but it would not be literary criticism; it would not be criticism at all. Lucian plays on language like a brilliant virtuoso. This professional littérateur or rhetorician, whose craft includes a mastery over terms of speech, is not on the same footing as the early Christian doctor. *Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem*, is a maxim which holds in literary criticism as well as elsewhere. Proportionately, the "medical" traits in Luke's diction are striking, too striking under the circumstances to be explained as the result of a widespread acquaintance with the language of culture. What Mr. Cadbury's position is, with regard to Luke, it is difficult to determine. He never discusses the tradition though he speaks once, and quite correctly, about Luke's medical knowledge (p. 112), observing that in ix. 11 "Luke quite independently has added one of his characteristic notes of healing." Why "characteristic," I cannot see, upon the arguments adduced in the essay. And elsewhere he allows

[1] I have not checked his data, but they would require verification, even if they could be considered relevant. Thus I notice among the words in Lucian which he tabulates as "found in no writer before Polybius except Hippocrates" (p. 70) is φλογμός. Now φλογμός certainly occurs in Euripides.

that "we have no way of knowing how far medical language had penetrated into the vocabulary of every-day life" (p. 49, see further page 62)—a concession which cuts against himself as well as against his opponents. But, without pressing such considerations, we may examine his specific pleas; it is when we pass from generalisations to definite data that we can test his theories. For the purpose of brevity and point I shall confine myself almost entirely to the third gospel, since it is there that we have the means of comparing Luke's style with that of others.

(1) To begin with, it is undisputed that the third gospel presents a series of "medical" characteristics, whatever be our explanation of their origin. There is no need to exaggerate them,[1] but on the other hand it is uncritical to minimise them. The fact that Luke takes a special interest in the healing ministry of Jesus is obvious, even to a cursory reader of his gospel. He adds to Mark's commission of the twelve the order καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν, and if it be retorted that Matthew does the same, as in the story of the feeding of the five thousand (Matt. xiv. 14 = Luke ix. 11), we can point to the distinctively Lucan touch in v. 17 (καὶ δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν), and to the frequency of ἰᾶσθαι[2] and of δύναμις "in the sense of a healing power" in his narrative;[3] furthermore, as Mr. Cadbury admits, even in his abbreviated version (vi. 17–19) of the Marcan text, there are no fewer than three allusions to healing, and a word like ἀσθένεια occurs four times in his gospel, while its only occurrence in the other synoptists is in a solitary LXX

[1] Professor Burkitt, e.g., thinks it "probable that Luke the Physician preferred to leave out the metaphor of amputation" in Matthew v. 29–30 (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 159).

[2] Why Luke ignored the LXX version of Isaiah lxi. 1 (ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν) in his quotation at iv. 18–19, is a problem; Dr. E. A. Abbott offers solutions in *Clue* 149a and *The Son of Man* 3584a.

[3] Cadbury, p. 112. This feature had been already noted by Dr. Colin Campbell in his *Critical Studies in St. Luke*, pp. 31 f.

citation. It is not necessary to labour the point any further. No serious critic would deny that of the three synoptic writers Luke is distinguished by a characteristic interest in healing. This does not prove, of course, that he was himself a physician, but it fits into the tradition quite naturally. It has also to be remembered that the " medical " interest is revealed by more than merely linguistic touches, and that its pervasive atmosphere justifies the critic in deciding elsewhere upon linguistic data which otherwise might be left an open question.

(2) But Mr. Cadbury attempts to undermine the assumption which might be drawn from this fact; he tabulates, for example, on p. 47 a list of nineteen " good medical terms " which occur, not in Luke but in Mark and Matthew. So that we must not attach too much importance to Luke's interest! But the force of this list is much more apparent than real. No fewer than seven of these terms occur in passages to which there is no parallel in Luke: *ἄγκιστρον*, *διυλίζω*, *κυλλός*, *κώνωψ*, *μυρίζω*, *σκώληξ*, and *σμυρνίζω*. Four others occur in passages which were omitted by Luke for various reasons; e.g. in the woe against the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 23), after *ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον* he omits *καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον*, merely putting in *καὶ τὸ πήγανον* and adding a generic term, as he was fond of doing—*καὶ πᾶν λάχανον*. Similarly *κολοβόω* is left out, because he alters the sense of Mark xiii. 20=Matthew xxiv. 22, omitting the apocalyptic [1] phrase about the " shortening of the days " and substituting an idea more intelligible to his Gentile Christian readers. The omission of *πώρωσις* in vi. 10 is due, as Mr. Cadbury himself allows elsewhere (part ii., p. 90), to Luke's frequent habit of omitting " human emotions

[1] In Barnabas iv. 3 there is an Enoch-quotation (" for to this end has the Lord cut short the seasons and the days that his Beloved might hasten and come to his inheritance ").

and expressions of feeling on Christ's part." Nor are the remaining instances any more cogent. Thus, *ξηραίνω* is certainly omitted by Luke in viii. 44, but his own substitute *ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις* is equally "medical," and, as it happens, he omits altogether the other Marcan story (xi. 20 f.) about the cursing of the fig-tree in which it occurs. As for *ἐρεύγομαι*, it merely occurs in a LXX quotation in Matthew (xiii. 35), which is entirely omitted by Luke; and *αἱμορροέω*, or *πυρέσσω*, is only exchanged for an equally "medical" phrase. The omission of *ἄρρωστος* in ix. 11 is discounted by the similar fact that it is replaced by a "medical" equivalent, while the absence of a parallel passage to Mark vi. 5 invalidates any argument from its other occurrence in the synoptic tradition, just as in the case of *προσκεφάλαιον*. Again, Mark does use *ἀφρίζω* in his description (ix. 18, 20) of epilepsy, and Luke does not; but this is more than counterbalanced by the fact that Luke replaces it by the "medical" phrase *μετ' ἀφροῦ*. There is not anything, therefore, in this contention which invalidates the impression that Luke's "medical" interest [1] is distinctive among the synoptists.

(3) The same conclusion is forced upon us as we test a similar plea which is put forward with much ingenuity on p. 48. We are invited to notice that Luke sometimes does not bring out the same interest on the part of Jesus in his patients as Mark and Matthew do; it is held that this tells against the likelihood of him being a physician, since in that case he would never have suggested any such details. Now, to begin with, this is far too rigid a canon of literary criticism.

[1] Mr. Cadbury quotes (p. 64), with apparent approval, Clemen's assertion (*Hibbert Journal*, 1910, p. 786) that no Greek physician could "represent the good Samaritan (Luke x. 34) as pouring on the wounds of the man who had fallen among robbers oil and wine." But this was a well-known salve in Jewish medicine; it is mentioned in the Mishna (*Sabbath* xix. 2) as a liniment for wounds. Luke's allusion to this popular Jewish remedy is a proof how he could reproduce local colour.

Take a crucial example. It is indubitable that Luke emphasises, more than Mark or Matthew does, the significance of prayer in the life of Jesus, as Mr. Cadbury himself notices later on (p. 113). Yet Luke leaves out one very important reference to prayer (iv. 42)! It is uncritical to apply too hard-and-fast a rule, in working out the traces of such predilections in an author, and the same caution must be observed in handling the "medical" allusions. No one would claim or expect Luke to be obsessed by the desire to bring them in, during the course of his narrative. Besides, even the alleged [1] instances of his failure to do so are susceptible of a different interpretation. He does not, says Mr. Cadbury, mention that Jesus took hold of the woman's hand when he cured her (iv. 39), though Mark and Matthew both mention this. But what does this imply? If it is significant, to what does it point? The answer is easy. Elsewhere Luke displays a certain reluctance to suggest that Jesus touched or was touched by people; this is one of the "changes perhaps attributable to religious motives" (pp. 90 f.), as Mr. Cadbury himself suggests (p. 92: "even allusions to Jesus' use of physical contact in working cures are omitted by Luke"), although it is only fair to recall that Luke records how Jesus touched the bier of the young man at Nain (vii. 14), and that he alone mentions that Jesus laid his hands upon every one of the sick people (iv. 40) as he cured them at Capernaum. As for the description of the epileptic boy (viii. 37 f.) and the lunatic at Gergesa (ix. 37 f.), it is inaccurate to say that Luke omits the serious

[1] Surely it is not serious criticism to argue that Luke is not more "medical" than the others because he "does not mention (ix. 6) as does Mark (vi. 13) that the twelve in their mission of preaching and practising anointed their patients with olive oil." This may not have been medical but sacramental. Even if it were a "medical" remedy, Luke may have omitted it just because he was a doctor. It does not occur in Matthew (Q), and the omission anyhow is no more significant than that of "repentance" in their mission.

symptoms chronicled by Mark and Matthew; e.g. in ix. 39 he does include "foaming." And if he leaves out Mark's (ix. 21) question and answer, this is, as Mr. Cadbury elsewhere admits (pp. 79 f.) because, as usual, he is shortening the dialogue, not because he fails to bring out, as a physician would, the conversation that accompanies a diagnosis.[1]

(4) The argument fares no better when it is applied to the specifically "medical" terms which are to be found in the Lucan writings. On pp. 43 f., for example, Mr. Cadbury quotes a list of eighteen such "medical" words used by Luke, and then remarks that this list "cannot be given too much weight, as it is natural that any writer's description of purely medical matters should find parallels in the books of medicine." Now, to begin with, when we look at this list, we notice that some of the terms are not employed by Luke in connexion with "purely medical matters" at all; *ἀνάπηρος* is not, in xiv. 13, 21, neither is *ἄτεκνος*, for there is nothing "purely medical" about xx. 28–30. Further, Mr. Cadbury argues that as Luke sometimes uses "medical" words in an untechnical sense, this more than offsets any argument from the fact that he does use "words in the same technical sense as the doctors do." That is, if Luke does happen to use "medical terms," it really counts for little, and if he does not use such terms in their strict sense, it counts for much against him. This does not seem to me very cogent literary criticism. And one application of it is peculiarly unsound. Luke does employ some "medical" terms quite freely; *ἐκλείπω*, for example, is not employed of the pulse failing (Luke had no occasion to mention that symptom), *ἐπιδημέω* is not used to describe the spread of an epidemic, and *ῥῆγμα* describes the ruin of a house, not a

[1] The point of Mark ix. 21 is really that noted by Dr. Allan Menzies: "Here, as in the case of the Gerasene, Jesus resorts to soothing measures, talking quietly and asking questions" (*The Earliest Gospel*, p. 179).

rupture. What then? Literary criticism has a clear answer; the physician in such cases uses such terms without feeling bound to their "pathological" connotation, as any literary person, who was a doctor, would feel quite free to do. Unhappily, Mr. Cadbury sees in this a most suspicious feature. He asks (p. 58), "Would an English physician be more, or less, likely than a layman to use in their non-medical sense such common words as appendix, eruption, operate, pulse, stool, ward?" If this means that it is unlikely that an author, who was medically trained, would use medical terms in an ordinary sense, or that he would scrupulously adhere to their professional meaning, I am afraid literary criticism is quite decisive against any such notions. Authors who are doctors do use such language quite freely and flexibly. If Mr. Cadbury will look over the pages of his fellow-countryman, Dr. O. W. Holmes, for example, I am sure he will discover that this canon of literary criticism collapses. I quote one case. Near the very beginning of the *Autocrat at the Breakfast Table*, we come on this sentence: "Our social arrangement has this great beauty, that its strata shift up and down or they change specific gravity, without being clogged by layers of prescription." Here we have "prescription" employed quite freely, in a non-medical sense; yet it is a most medical term! Dr. Holmes uses it with as much readiness and flexibility as any layman could do. So with Sir Thomas Browne. The *Religio Medici*, opened almost at random, offers instances of what I mean. As, for instance, in i. 38: "I thank God I have not these straight *ligaments*, or narrow obligations to the world, as to dote on life"; or in ii. 48: "I have often beheld, as a miracle, that artificial resurrection and revivification of mercury, how being *mortified* into a thousand shapes, it assumes again its own." One of the very words proposed as a test by Mr. Cadbury occurs in the

*Religio Medici* (i. 55) in a non-pathological sense : " whilst we lie at close ward against one vice, we lie not open to the veney of another." A medical man, who has turned author, never is under any such restraint as is suggested in this essay.

(5) Sometimes Mr. Cadbury even argues against one or two of the " medical " terms used by Luke, that they cannot be grouped as evidence because they happen to occur in the Septuagint, in one sense or another. This contention seems to me to turn against his own sceptical position. If these terms occur in the Septuagint, they were certainly familiar or accessible to Matthew ; why is it, then, that we find Luke, not Matthew, repeating them ? If any well-educated Greek could employ such terms, especially through his familiarity with the Septuagint, how is it that writers like Matthew and Mark do not, while another writer, Luke, does ? Luke could have found them in the Septuagint, it is argued ; he required no professional training to be familiar with them. Granted ; but how was it that *he* found them, and not Matthew ? It is not in this way that a critic can evade the inferences drawn from Lucan terms like *ἀνάψυξις*, *ἀποψύχω*, *ἀτενίζω*, *ἐκψύχω*, *ἐνοχλέω*, *ἐπιμελῶς*, etc., etc.

(6) Finally, another argument that crumbles away is Mr. Cadbury's analysis of what he terms " the most specious list of all," viz., that of the longer medical expressions employed by Luke. Luke, for example, describes Peter's mother-in-law as *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*, instead of repeating the single term *πυρέσσουσα* used by Mark and Matthew. This may fairly be taken as a water-mark of his professional training, which had taught him to distinguish between *great*, or severe, and *small* fevers—as Galen puts it. But Mr. Cadbury tries to whittle away this inference by recalling " Luke's fondness " for the adjective *μέγας* ; i.e., his suggestion is that the phrase is simply a stylistic alteration of

Mark's text. Well, it might be stylistic,[1] and yet also "medical." But "Luke's 'fondness' for the adjective *μέγας*" is a myth. Sometimes he deliberately changes Mark's *μέγας* into *ἱκανός*, as at viii. 32, or omits it altogether, as in viii. 23, 24, 25, 56. The similar plea against *πλήρης λέπρας* as a "medical" phrase in v. 12 is equally unconvincing. Luke was fond of the adjective, we are told; it is a literary mannerism, no more. But he only uses it at one other place in the gospel, and there (iv. 1) as in Acts he is describing psychological experiences, so that it is captious to use such an argument here; indeed Mr. Cadbury later on (p. 58) admits with characteristic candour that "*πλήρης*, in this connexion peculiar to St. Luke, is frequently thus used in the medical writers." It would be superfluous to heap up further illustrations; what I have indicated is sufficient to show that this line of argument is far from being valid.

The general conclusion, so far as I can draw it, after going carefully over Mr. Cadbury's pages, is that Luke's style, when examined by legitimate tests of literary criticism, does exhibit more evidence of "medical" interest than the language of other writers in his circle who were not physicians, that this evidence may be termed "striking," and that, apart altogether from matters of linguistic detail, Harnack's verdict remains unimpugned, viz., that "nearly all of the alterations and additions which the third evangelist has made in the Marcan text are most simply and surely explained from the professional interest of a physician." For "very nearly all" it would be safer to substitute "a number"; but the number is sufficiently weighty to form a proof. The tradition about Luke as a physician and the "pathological" traits of his style fit into each other quite

[1] Though later on (p. 118), forgetting what he had said, Mr. Cadbury points out that "Luke sometimes omits or tones down emphatic words, such as *μέγας*"!

satisfactorily, unless we are to criticise in the air and be sceptical wantonly. We are indebted to Mr. Cadbury for a capital, if somewhat mechanical, tabulation of linguistic information about Luke's vocabulary and style—for, after all, the section on the "medical" element (pp. 39 f.) is merely a short section of the larger investigation. But the contentions of that section fail; the "medical" element in Luke cannot be explained away by the hypothesis that he was simply a better educated person than either Matthew or Mark.

Mr. Augustine Birrell once playfully observed, in connexion with an essay written by a friend for the first series of *Obiter Dicta*, that "in order to enjoy the pleasure of reading your own books over and over again, it is essential that they should be written either wholly or in part by somebody else." Mr. Cadbury's essay has been written in part by another hand. This is a pity, however. His monograph is one of the Harvard Theological Studies, and one of the editors of that useful series has seen fit to insert a long note on pp. 51–54. He begins by chronicling J. G. Winckler's *dissertatio de Luca Evangelista medico*, which was published in 1736, one of the earliest monographs upon the "medical" tinge in Luke's vocabulary. "Down to the middle of the nineteenth century it was regularly cited in the 'literature' on Luke, but I discover no evidence that anybody had seen it in the meanwhile." Well, if the editor will look, for example, at the New Testament *Introductio* of Dr. J. G. Pritius, edited and enlarged by M. C. G. Hofmann (Leipzig, 1737), he will find what he wants at once. Hofmann (pp. 178–179, and later on p. 185) refers to Winckler's recent treatise, when recapitulating earlier work on the subject: "quae de S. Luca medico dici possunt, uberius digessit laudatissimus Dn. Wincklerus, Hamburgensis Gymnasii doctor magnique Fabricii successor, in elegantissima

dissertatione *de Luca medico*." But what this editor's inability to trace the use of Winckler has to do with the matter, it is hard to see, unless he means to suggest that later writers quoted or mentioned the essay without having read it. I am afraid this is not an unfair interpretation of the passage, for he proceeds to insinuate that those who think there is "medical" language in Luke have simply quoted at second-hand, either from Dr. Hobart or from Wettstein. "Those who plough with his heifer"—he is referring to Wettstein—"have such faith in him that they deem it superfluous to look up his references or even read his quotations." He then sneers at "Hobart and his *pedisequi*," mentioning Harnack, Zahn, and myself, for putting down *κραιπάλη* "among the words which show Luke to be versed in Greek medical literature." Whereas, we are informed, "these scholars might have read in Galen in so many words (*κραιπάλας . . πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀνομάζουσι τὰς ἐξ οἴνου βλάβας τῆς κεφαλῆς*, actually quoted in full by Wettstein on Luke xxi. 31, the verse in which Hobart and his *pedisequi* discover it to be a medical word !)" that *κραιπάλη* is not a technical term of pathology, but one used by all the Greeks. I am obliged for the reference to Wettstein, though it happens to be inaccurate ; the note is on xxi. 34, not xxi. 31. But what I found in Galen was what the editor might have found there, if he had looked up his reference, viz., a remark about the etymology of *κραιπάλη*. The great medical authority is not asserting that *κραιπάλη* is untechnical ; he is pointing out (*οὕτως γοῦν ἔνιοι κτλ.*, he continues) that some Greeks derived the word from *κάρηνον πάλλεσθαι*. The contrast is not between medical and non-medical Greeks, as Mr. Cadbury's editor seems to imagine from the few words quoted by Wettstein,[1] but between *πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες*

[1] I have always used Kühn's edition of Galen in *Medicorum Graecorum opera quae exstant*. The *κραιπάλη* reference is from his commentary on the *ἀφορισμοί* of Hippocrates (v. 5) in vol. xvii. 788.

and *ἔνιοι*, and Galen's point is that while the term is commonly used by Greeks, it is variously derived. The use of *Ἕλληνες* in Galen is a well-known problem. Sometimes he means by it "Greeks" as distinguished from *Ἀττικοί*. Sometimes he employs it more broadly, as W. Herbst remarks; "Haud raro etiam eis qui vel noviciis vel vulgaribus vel peregrinis vel soloecis vocibus utebantur, opponuntur '*Ἕλληνες*.'" [1] Here it may be in the latter sense, if any special significance attaches to it. Anyhow, in reading through some of Galen's treatises, especially the Hippocratean, for the purpose of noting some pathological parallels to the Lucan diction, it seemed to me not irrelevant to put down *κραιπάλη*, since Luke alone mentions this physical condition in his warning against being unprepared for the final catastrophe, just as he is particular to add *καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι* in his version of the unfaithful servant's misbehaviour (xii. 45). I am sorry to have to write thus about the Harvard editor, but it is only fair to Mr. Cadbury to separate this unfortunate note from his monograph; he is invariably courteous himself. The odd thing is to find that the note has attracted attention in unexpected quarters, insomuch that even Professor Burkitt has been carried away. When he reviewed the first part of Mr. Cadbury's essay in *The Journal of Theological Studies* (1920, pp. 342–343) he innocently quoted the bulk of this "delightful editorial note." Evidently he forgot to verify its statements. Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake go still further; they are convinced [2] "that the whole of the contention as to the medical language of Luke is an immense fallacy," but the half-dozen pages they give to the subject are no more than a hasty summary of Mr. Cadbury's plea. We can understand, however, the relief it must have been to them to be

[1] *Galeni Pergameni de Atticissantium Studiis Testimonia* (1911), p. 10.
[2] *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ii. p. 355).

quite positive about anything in connexion with Luke, even about a negation.

JAMES MOFFATT.

## *JOHN THEODORE MERZ.*

1. *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* 4 vols. By John Theodore Merz. William Blackwood & Sons.
2. *Religion and Science : a Philosophical Essay.* By John Theodore Merz. William Blackwood & Sons.
3. *A Fragment on the Human Mind.* By John Theodore Merz. William Blackwood & Sons.

"THE world knows nothing of its greatest men." So wrote a dramatist, himself now not greatly remembered, of the nineteenth century. But we must at least try to keep up the memory of those who have deserved eminently well of their fellow-mortals ; among whom, in this generation, the great scientific manufacturer and philosophical theorist whose name is prefixed to the present article, who died on March 21st this year, must be reckoned.

To the world at large Dr. Theodore Merz was chiefly known as the author of a literary work of extraordinary depth and range, the *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, a work in which he traversed the whole of science and philosophy, describing the growth of thought in both provinces, principally in the three countries of England, France and Germany ; but not altogether ignoring what has been written beyond those limits.

His intellectual power was shown in the ways just named ; but the heart is greater than the intellect ; and Dr. Merz threw his heart with the greatest emotion (though not with any vain effusiveness) into two works which he published after the greatest labours of his life had terminated ; one entitled *Religion and Science*, in the year 1915 ; the other

entitled *A Fragment on the Human Mind*, in the year 1919. Without claiming that these two works are absolutely faultless, it may justly be said that they—and especially the first of the two—give true enlightenment on the subjects of deepest human interest.

Their scope and value can only be shown by taking the subjects with which they deal in order. The work on *Religion and Science*, after certain preliminary observations, begins its important questionings as follows :

> What are presumably the earliest experiences of a conscious infant mind, and in what order does it gradually gain that wider horizon and more complicated aggregate and flow of sensations, perceptions, ideas, imaginations, desires, and purposeful volitions which constitute at any moment the state of the adult mind ? *Religion and Science*, p. 30.

The danger of mistaking the meaning of this question, and of substituting another question for it, is then explained in the following paragraphs :

> It is only in quite recent times that attempts have been made to . . . deal with the gradual growth and development of individual consciousness, instead of starting at once with the adult mind and its functions, as known to us from the intellectual side mainly through language, and on the active side through the observable conduct of our fellow-men.
>
> That this is, however, the true object of introspective psychology is being more and more recognised by philosophical writers ; as is evident from the many passages in philosophical works—and those not exclusively psychological—in which single traits in the history of the individual mind are described, frequently in much detail and with great clearness. . . .
>
> But, as I stated above, there is always the danger lurking in the background of abandoning the purely introspective aspect and introducing arguments and observations drawn from the external world ; the most seductive of these being supplied by words and language. Now the latter are entirely a creation of the adult mind, to which the experiences of the child's mind must gradually accommodate themselves ; they are therefore not immediately expressive of the pre-intellectual, almost entirely emotional state of feelings and desires which constituted the earlier stages of mental development.
>
> The fact also that for the adult mind—and increasingly so as

civilisation progresses—the outer world becomes more important and through the progress of scientific knowledge to some persons almost overwhelming, makes us forget that in the earliest stages of our life no outer world exists at all; that the knowledge of it has to be acquired very gradually; that it has slowly to emerge out of the cloudland of infantile feelings and desires.

We find in modern philosophical literature frequent reference to the genesis of our belief in an external world, but many of the arguments brought forward are based upon logical deductions more fitted to justify the existence of such a belief than to explain how the belief arose in each individual instance. *Religion and Science*, pp. 30–33.

It will be seen that in the above paragraphs the question of the *origin* of our knowledge is being separated from the question of the *validity* of our knowledge. They are different questions; but it will be admitted by the thoughtful reader that the validity of our knowledge cannot be certain unless we know its origin. Hence Dr. Merz, after separating the two questions, reunites them, and proceeds to deal with the more profound of the two, the question how our knowledge had its first birth and origin. He does this as follows:

Among all the general or abstract notions with which the developing mind has to become familiar, none is more fundamental than that of Reality. As stated above, all mental experiences have one reality in common. They are simply there, they happen. This is the reality to which Descartes referred all knowledge and all certainty, as the ultimate test. But in practical life we have a further additional test of reality: we distinguish between experiences which we stigmatise as merely apparent, and others to which we attribute actual existence; and we term the latter objective or external in contrast with the former which are purely subjective.

The question arises as to the criteria of this additional reality, this more pregnant form of existence. This problem of the criteria of external existence may be answered by an appeal to the verdict of adult and educated persons.

I may, e.g., invite each of my readers to try and answer this question for himself. In works on psychology we find definite answers to it. We are told that an experience originally subjective acquires that additional impress of actual reality by being, e.g., permanent or recurring, by being experienced by other persons, by fitting into that general order of things which we term the outer world—i.e. by standing in relation to other experiences, by having

a definite location or generally what we term in microscopic work definition, which implies clear outline and vividness.

Now all these and a variety of other properties which qualify a subjective experience to be in addition objective or real, in the more pregnant sense of the word, may describe with tolerable completeness the means by which the adult mind answers the question as to reality, but they do not answer the question how the infant mind may possibly arrive at the notion of reality—or, to express it more crudely, how it arrives at the notion of things.

It seems to me that the principal experience of the infant mind which will lead from a vague to a more definite notion of something externally real has been omitted in the list of criteria given above. This is Personality. Ibid., pp. 34–36.

But how does Personality enter into the matter? Dr. Merz answers this question by quoting passages from three writers with whose view he absolutely and entirely associates himself; a German, Wilhelm Dilthey, who wrote in 1890; an Englishman, William Wallace, who wrote in 1894; and a Frenchman, Gabriel Tarde, who wrote in 1897; three writers who had (it is believed) no knowledge of each other, and who expressed the same view spontaneously. It will be simplest if I quote the passage from William Wallace, which occurs in his Gifford Lectures:

The mother, already enriched with reason and love, bending over her infant, does not by her glance, her smile, her touch, give it a soul, a spirit, a reason; and yet in that glance, that smile, that touch, soul, spirit, reason are as surely born as the physiological life of the same child is born, and so far as we know is only born, in the congress of male and female. As in that case the elements of the living being, the constituents which build up structure, are older, far older, than the two parents, who to popular apprehension are the authors of the being of their progeny; so in the spiritual world, the child and its mother severally bring to their union of soul a store of powers and faculties prepared by, it may be, centuries of inherited tradition. Yet it is in the main true, that it is the mother's and father's look and touch . . . which kindles into flame the dull materials of humanity, and begins that sacred birth, that spiritual parentship which, at least not less than the first, should be the peculiar glory of human father and motherhood.

Thus is a soul born into vivid life; Personality is inter-

woven with all things known to us from the very first; our knowledge of spiritual being does not follow upon our knowledge of material things, but precedes it, and is actually a vivifying cause of our sensuous knowledge. "Intersubjective communion," to use the phraseology of James Ward, is our human inheritance.

The power of the above analysis will be admitted; and as it is the first step in a great argument, it has been desirable to explain it with some fullness; the succeeding steps may perhaps be understood, even if more briefly given. Dr. Merz goes on to show how the external world, as we know it, is formed for our perceptions by a process of abstraction and selection from the entire field of sensation and feeling; how the discoveries of science bring in further abstractions; and how, illuminating as these discoveries are, the peculiarly human elements of emotion and purpose do not readily fit into them; so that scientific minds are apt to reject emotion and purpose from the field of true knowledge. Not that scientific minds are incapable of apprehending artistic beauty, or the charm of musical harmonies; but still, scientific minds do not accept these as governing elements in the world of our knowledge.

Against this narrowing tendency of the scientific mind (for we, as well as he, may think it narrowing) Dr. Merz brings in the final strain of his argument. He will not allow that emotion and purpose lie outside the true governing elements in the world of our knowledge; and therefore, lastly, he points out that the totality of our experiences (in which practical action is concerned as well as theoretical science) obtains its unity through those great subjects which we call morality and religion; that these great subjects have had a history of their own, and a character in many respects different from the character of material science; they transcend material science, and must

not be limited by scientific conceptions; something is inherent in them, which we may call miracle.

This is true and important; though I admit that Dr. Merz does not appear to me to recognise with sufficient explicitness the need of criticism, which cannot be dispensed with in religious any more than in secular history; but still the intrinsic and deep-lying unity in Christianity, a religion of which the power is unquestionable in the world as we see it, is a fact which bears witness to reality, though it be reality of a different order from that which we call scientific.

In this final stage of Dr. Merz's philosophy, I must not be content with describing his view; his own expressions are important, and the reader must be put in direct possession of his religious feeling. That man cannot escape the feeling of dependence is one of his primary principles, and the following passage will show how he applies it. He has been urging that the infantile search after reality, with which we began life, must have its counterpart in some search undertaken by the adult mind; and then he proceeds thus:

> The result of this search is, as we have said before, the religious or spiritual view of the world and life. Its central conception is an interpretation of our ever-recurring feeling of dependence with its characteristic sphere of emotions, the foremost of which are fear, reverence, and love; they all spring from our relations to other beings like ourselves. On a lower level and for the ordinary uses of common life they are embodied in the statutes and customs of the society in which we live and move.
>
> A higher interpretation sees in them the workings of a highest Spiritual Power.
>
> The effect of this spiritual revelation manifests itself mainly in our active life, as it has also gradually grown up and found expression through spiritual intercourse or communion with our fellowmen. But as we are unable to trace in our individual history the successive stages of our intellectual awakening, of our entrance into the full daylight of a physical world, so also we are unable to trace the slow growth of the spiritual revelation which runs through human history and has culminated for us in the Christian view of the world.

That here the personal element plays the foremost part must be evident to any one who accepts the view which we have tried to explain. And with this personal element we cannot exclude the mysterious or miraculous character of the entire process. *Religion and Science*, pp. 189–190.

The significance of this passage, to those who have any feeling for the spiritual at all, is obvious. But it will be well to reinforce it by two quotations from the other book that has been mentioned, *A Fragment of the Human Mind*, published in 1919. On page 260 of this book, after referring to the necessity, at the present day, of "finding the way back to a unity similar to, though in some ways quite different from, that which with all its deficiencies and drawbacks ruled the Christian world in the Middle Ages," he adds the following noteworthy remarks on two famous modern writers:

No scientific thinker has realised this necessity more than Auguste Comte, whose influence, by spreading the Positive or scientific spirit, has been as great as his failure to evolve out of the Positivist view of the world a satisfactory moral system or what he termed a Religion of Humanity.

And, next to Comte, no thinker has made it clearer than Huxley in his statement referred to above, that the moral or spiritual view of life stands in apparent opposition to what we may call the natural order of things.

The opposition which Huxley has spoken of is that between the famous biological principle, "the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest," and the principle of self-sacrificing love.

And now for the last passage which I will quote from Dr. Merz; it will be found on page 279 of the *Fragment*.

In the Christian conception . . . truth and love are identified. We are shown in this identity not only the realised ideal of morality or the good, but also the realised ideal of knowledge. For according to this view, truth and love are not only the highest attributes, but also the very essence of the supreme Reality which we call God.

The pre-Christian world and profane philosophy ever since, and down to the present day, continually ask the question "What is

truth ?" For the Christian believer the answer is love; and this answer was given, not by any intellectual exposition, but by the life and death of Jesus.

Those who wish to understand John Theodore Merz more completely must consult the two books on which comment has here been made. It is permissible to say here, that the author of the foregoing paragraphs was worthy of that honour and love which the true Christian may claim.

JOHN RICKARDS MOZLEY.

## *BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD—A BIBLIOGRAPHY.*[1]

Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., "the most able and learned defender of orthodox Calvinism in the present generation," was born at Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A., on November 5, 1851. His father, William Warfield, was by occupation a farmer. His mother, Mary Cabell Breckinridge Warfield, was daughter of Professor Robert Breckinridge, an illustrious name in Presbyterian America. He was brought up, says a colleague, in a Christian home which cherished noble family traditions and intellectual ideals. He was only sixteen when he made an open profession of his personal faith in Christ. In the following year he became a student of what is now the University of Princeton. He graduated in Arts in 1871 with the highest honours. He displayed a special talent for Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, and, in the circumstances, it was not strange that upon finishing his course at the University, he should be disposed to qualify for a teachership in science. While of that mind, he sojourned for fully a year in Europe. But the more he reflected on his future career, the more he realised the paramount claims of God and of religion upon him. The result was that he resolved to study for the ministry, and with that end in view became a student of the Princeton Theological Seminary.

That was in 1873. In 1876 he graduated in Divinity, and thereupon proceeded for a winter to the University of Leipzig, Germany, making studies which have the Greek New Testament their theme a speciality.

[1] The closing Address for Session 1921–1922, given in the Free Church College, Edinburgh, on March 23, 1922, by Rev. Prof. John R. Mackay. M.A.

On his return home he served as assistant in the First Presbyterian Church of Baltimore for about a year. In 1878 he was appointed Instructor, and in the following year was installed Professor of New Testament Exegesis, in Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pittsburg.

In 1887 he accepted a call to the Professorship of Systematic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, where, some thirty-four years afterwards, he finished an illustrious course. He was, in the happy phrase of the Editor of the *British Weekly*, a man of great personal charm.

Dr. Warfield was a prolific writer along theological lines, and the quality of what he wrote is recognised on all hands as being exceptionally good. Cherishing, as I do, that conviction very strongly, I should like, if I might, to quicken an interest in *Warfieldiana* in theological students who were only beginning their studies when Dr. Warfield was drawing his to a close, and I should also like my paper to serve as a pointer to some others who are thoroughly appreciative of Dr. Warfield's quality, but, through providential causes, may not be aware of the wealth of theological literature which issued from his ever active pen, and which are scattered, for the diligent to find out, through Biblical Dictionaries, Theological Encyclopædias, and Theological Reviews.

In the present enumeration of articles I shall follow, not the chronological order, but the order which is according to subject matter, and the natural arrangement in a theological structure. I shall speak of Warfield's Articles according as they connect themselves with

I. Apologetics,
II. Exegetics,
III. Systematics,
IV. Historics,

V. Symbolics,
VI. Homiletics,
VII. Miscellanea,

and in that order.

I. Apologetics. From the point of view of Theological Encyclopædia, Dr. Warfield put tremendous emphasis on the importance and value of Apologetics as the science which undertakes the establishment of that knowledge of God which Christianity professes to embody and seeks to make efficient in the world. No one, in this generation, emphasised the indispensableness of the quickening of the Holy Spirit in order to a *saving* knowledge of Christ more than did Dr. Warfield; yet when his friend, the late Dr. H. Bavinck, in a work on the "Certainty of Faith," belittled the value of Apologetics, whether to the natural man, because he was incapable of appreciating the argument, or to the spiritual man, because he did not need the appeal which Apologetics makes to pure reason, Dr. Warfield stoutly withstood this tendency, and dared even to write: "When we speak of Apologetics as a science, we have our eye not on the individual but on the thinking world. In the face of the world, with its opposing points of view, and its tremendous energy of thought and incredible fertility in attack and defence, Christianity must think through and organise its, not defence merely, but assault. It has been placed in the world to *reason* its way to the dominion of the world. And it is by reasoning its way that it has come to its kingship. By reasoning it will gather to itself its all. And by reasoning, it will put all its enemies under its feet" (P Th R 1903, p. 147).[1]

[1] In this paper:—
P Th R = *The Princeton Theological Review.*
A J Th = *The American Journal of Theology.*
Bibl S = *The Bibliotheca Sacra.*
B S = *The Bible Student.*

That Dr. Warfield, on the other hand, was recognised as himself an authority in Apologetics is borne out by the fact that the principal articles, in formal Apologetics, which appear in N Sch H are from his pen. These papers are brief, but brilliant. Not confining myself, however, to the N Sch H papers, I shall in this connexion name:

(*a*) The article on "Apologetics" in N Sch H in which we have an illuminating discussion of the general subject of Apologetics, and of the five topics with which, as he conceives the matter, Apologetics deals, to wit, God, Religion, Revelation, Christianity, the Bible.

(*b*) The article on "Agnosticism" in N Sch H may be regarded as Dr. Warfield's contribution to that department of Apologetics which deals with man's capacity as a thinking being to know God—psychological Apologetics.

(*c*) An article on "Revelation" in I S B E, in which the nature, the processes, and the modes of Revelation are discussed.

(*d*) An article in P R R, January, 1897, entitled "Christian Supernaturalism."

(*e*) I may in this connexion refer to a volume entitled,

---

D D B = Davis's *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Exp. = The Expositor.
Exp T = *The Expository Times.*
H D B = Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
H D C G = Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.*
H E R E = Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*
H R = *The Homiletic Review.*
H Th R = *The Harvard Theological Review.*
I S B E = *The International Standard Bible Encyclopædia.*
L Ch R = *The Lutheran Church Review.*
N Sch H = *The New Schaff Herzog.*
M Q R = *The Methodist Quarterly Review.*
P R = *The Presbyterian Review.*
P R R = *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review.*
P Q = *The Presbyterian Quarterly.*
S P R = *The Southern Presbyterian Review.*
U S R = *The Union Seminary Review.*
J B L = *The Journal of Biblical Literature.*

"Counterfeit Miracles," of some 330 pp., 8vo, which Charles Scribner's Sons of New York published for Professor Warfield in 1918. It is essentially a review of extra-biblical religious thaumaturgy from early Christian times to the present date. But I place it here among apologetical books, because it meets an objection to the Christian argument from miracles, of the form that miracles can be appealed to in support of many frauds, in this fashion: "Genuine miracles, having as their end and aim the authentication of the Apostles as messengers of God, passed away with the Apostles themselves." A timely volume.

(*f*) The article on "Atheism" in N Sch H, where Dr. Warfield discusses the meaning of the term, considers the question whether absolute atheism is possible, and ends with a brief review of the history of Atheism.

II. Exegetics. Dr. Warfield's interest in Apologetics was analogous to the interest that a builder with an architectonic mind has in the foundations of a house in the building of which he is engaged. It was not directly his own business as a teacher. But it was otherwise with Exegetics. This latter discipline was one with which he was as teacher directly concerned for nine years, and even after he formally took up Systematics as his proper subject, so great was his fondness for exegesis, and so high was his reputation as an exegete, that arrangements were made according to which it became his function, over and above his work in Systematics, to give lectures to an advanced class in Exegesis. I therefore name next in order some of Professor Warfield's contributions to the science of Exegesis.

A. Here one may for a moment refer to one or two contributions which Professor Warfield made towards O.T. studies:

(1) An article on "The Spirit in the Old Testament," which may be read in P R R, 1895, p. 582 f.

(2) An article on "The Divine Messiah in the Old Testament" which appeared in P Th R, 1916, p. 369 f.—of value as an important statement on the doctrine of the Person of our Lord.

B. But naturally, most of Professor Warfield's contributions of an exegetical kind bore upon New Testament matters. Among these latter I note:

(*a*) On the *Canon* of the New Testament:

(1) A booklet entitled "The Canon of the New Testament," published by the American Sunday School Union at Philadelphia in 1893.

(2) An important article on the "Canon" will be found in vol. xlii., pp. 554–564, of Bibl S.

(3) Two articles on "The Canonicity and Genuineness of Second Peter" which appeared in the January 1882 No. and in the April 1883 No. of S P R. These able articles were among the first of Professor Warfield's contributions to New Testament studies which brought their author to the notice of British New Testament scholars. Their significance has been remarked upon by Chase and Moffatt without accepting their conclusion, and by Salmon and Bigg, who homologate Warfield's argument.

(*b*) *The Text of the New Testament:*

(1) "An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," published by Hodder & Stoughton.

(2) An article in P R of April, 1882, entitled: "The Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort." These contributions are fitted to be still helpful to beginners in Textual Criticism who, as a rule, find Hort's *Introduction* steep reading, and are, in many cases, nonplussed as they attempt, for the first time, to read the Symbols through which Tischendorf speaks in his *Apparatus Criticus*.

(3) An article which appeared in P R R, 1897, pp. 780–

790, entitled, "Recent Discussions on the Text of the New Testament."

(*c*) On *Introduction and Analysis*. The most valuable item one can make mention of in this connexion is:

(1) Professor Warfield's "Syllabus on the Special Introduction to the Catholic Epistles," with which goes an Appendix in the form of a remarkably suggestive Synopsis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. To this may be added:

(2) Short but pithy articles on "James," "Peter," "Jude," in D D B.

(3) The Introduction to "The Acts and Pastoral Epistles," in the Temple Bible Series, is by Professor Warfield.

(4) An article on "The Unity of the Apocalypse," in P R, vol. 5, pp. 228–365.

(5) An article on "The Millennium and the Apocalypse" in P Th R, 1904, pp. 598–617.

(6) An article on "The Century's Progress in Biblical Knowledge" in H R, March, 1900.

(7) An article concerning Schmiedel's "Pillar Passages" in P Th R, 1913, pp. 177–269.

(*d*) Of contributions of an exactly *exegetical* nature may be noted the following:

(1) "Messianic Psalms in the New Testament"—a paper contributed to Exp, 3rd series, ii., pp. 301, 321 ff. (see Plummer on Luke, p. 27).

(2) "Little Ones": H D C G, *sub voce*.

(3) "The Christ that Paul Preached"—a doctrinal statement, but based upon an exegesis of Rom. i. 1–7. Exp, 8th series, xv., pp. 90–110.

(4) "The Prophecies of St. Paul"—in the form of three papers, the first of which has as its source 1 and 2 Thessalonians; the second, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians,

Romans; and the third, the later Epistles of Paul—all these papers in vol. iv. of the 3rd series of Exp.

(5) "Exegetical Notes on 1st Timothy"—in P R, vol. viii., pp. 500–8 and pp. 702–10.

(6) "God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"—in P Th R, 1917, pp. 1–20. Of high value in a doctrinal regard.

(7) A paper on "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption"—in P Th R, 1917, pp. 201–249.

(8) Two papers on "The Terminology of Love in the New Testament": P Th R, 1918, pp. 1–45 and pp. 153–203.

(9) "The Importunate Widow and the alleged Failure of Faith"—in Exp T, 1913–14, pp. 69–72 and 136–139.

(10) "Paul's Buffeting of his Body"—a paper in Exp T, 1919–20, pp. 520–521.

(11) A paper on "Antichrist" in Exp T, May, 1921.

(12) "Jesus Christ the Propitiation for the Whole World"—in Exp, 8th series, vol. xxi., pp. 241–283.

(13) "Praying for the Erring"—Exp T, Sept., 1919.

III. Systematics. In 1887, as we saw, it became Professor Warfield's rôle to teach Systematic Theology. Some admirers of Dr. Warfield have expressed the opinion that it might have been well if he had devoted his life to Exegesis. Possibly. At the same time, one cannot help admiring God's kind Providence towards His Church in leading an exegete of the highest order to make it his business, in the face of impugners of every shade, to bring the leading evangelical doctrines anew to the test of the most stringent and exacting exegesis so as to proclaim them once more to the world as beyond question the very truths of God. In all his dogmatics Dr. Warfield is supremely the exegete. His dogmatics is but exegesis of the superlative kind.

We are not, indeed, in the happy position of having from

his hands a full-orbed restatement of the Reformed System of Doctrine; we have only valuable contributions that may be compared to well chiselled stones fitted to take their place in a building that might have been. Probably the reason of this may be found in what, as literature, is one of the finest things Professor Warfield ever wrote—I mean:

(1) An article on "The Idea of Systematic Theology," which appeared in P R R 1986, pp. 243–271. From it, we see that Professor Warfield had a profound sense of the achievements of the past in the domain of Systematic Theology: "this (to him) is the first-born of the sciences, which to-day is in a state far nearer perfection than any other science, a fabric which is a miracle of Art, to which all ages and lands bring their varied tribute. The subtle Greek laid the foundations, the law-loving Roman raised high the wall, and all the perspicuity of France and the ideality of Germany and systematisation of Holland and deep sobriety of Britain have been expended in perfecting the structure."

In this regard, Professor Warfield held that the beginning of wisdom lay for himself in an understanding and recognition of what his predecessors had already achieved. The analogy which he would like to follow is found in the method of those builders to whom the world owes "the structure of those great cathedrals whose splendid piles glorify the history of Art in the Middle Ages, the condition of whose progress in building was that each succeeding generation should build upon the foundation laid by its predecessor." He naturally had little respect for a good deal that, with utter want of appreciation of what had already been achieved, was being offered in the name of Theology in his own time by men whose analogue he maintained was "that Irish Architect who," according to Coleridge, "took out the foundation stone in order to repair the roof." It

seemed therefore to Professor Warfield that he himself would be most usefully employed, if, still carrying on the figure of the Cathedral, he "gave his best efforts to rounding the arches, carving the capitals, and fitting in the fretted roof." And that is practically what he has done. And yet, as we shall find, there are few doctrines of the Reformed system to which he has not made some contribution. And he touched nothing that he did not adorn.

Before I come to deal with the several doctrines with which Dr. Warfield had dealt, I should like

(2) to refer to another article entitled "The Right of Systematic Theology," which meets us *in limine* and which appeared in P R R, 1896, pp. 417–458. It is in the main an answer to objections to the usefulness of Systematic Theology on the ground, forsooth, that Christianity consists of facts, not of doctrines, or, that Christianity is a life, not doctrine.

(3) The one subject in connexion with Systematic Theology on which, more than perhaps any other, Dr. Warfield has left in writing all that needs to be said in that regard is the *Inspiration* of the Scriptures, the *principium cognoscendi* of a right theology.

(*a*) The primary study in Warfield's teaching concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures is one in which he proceeded joint author with Professor A. A. Hodge in an article entitled "Inspiration," which appeared in the April 1881 No. of P R.

(*b*) "The Origin of the Bible," 1882.

(*c*) An article entitled "The Real Problem of Inspiration," which appeared in P R R, 1892, pp. 177–221, an article which so far as Dr. Warfield's standpoint is concerned goes to the heart of the question. In this article the writer starts with the affirmation that the historic Christian Church has held that the Bible is the Word of God in such a sense

that its words are the Words of God. The evidence for this belief is twofold: (1) It is exactly what the New Testament teaches on the subject of the nature of Scripture. (2) Implicit credence is due to our Lord and His Apostles in this as in the other Christian doctrines which they delivered us. In this article, Professor Warfield ventures the opinion "that no single error has as yet been *demonstrated* to occur in the Scriptures as given by God to His Church."

(*d*) The same volume of P R R in which the foregoing article appears contains another very instructive and interesting article on "The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture."

(*e*) Another weighty contribution from Professor Warfield's pen to the subject matter of Inspiration will be found in P R R, 1894, pp. 600–653, the title of which is: "Professor H. P. Smith on Inspiration."

(*f*) A valuable article on Inspiration which appeared in Bibl S, vol. lxiv., entitled "The Inspiration of the Bible."

(*g*) Another article entitled: "God-inspired Scriptures," appeared in P R R 1900, pp. 89–130, the purport of which is to prove that the term *θεόπνευστος* is one which is expressive of the origination and not of the effects of the Scriptures. *Θεόπνευστος*, as averred of all Scripture, means "God-breathed," that is, produced by the creative breath of the Almighty. One is glad to find Professor Moffatt in his "The Approach to the New Testament" amply acknowledging the conclusiveness of Dr. Warfield's reasoning in the present article as an exegetical question.

(*h*) An article entitled "It says: Scripture says: God says," which appeared in P R R 1899, pp. 472–510, in which the conclusion is reached that, as formulæ introducing O.T. statements, these three expressions are equipollent.

(*i*) Perhaps no article which Professor Warfield wrote reveals his extraordinarily minute and profound acquaint-

ance with the wide ranges of classical Greek literature to the same extent as does the paper on "The Oracles of God," which appeared in P R R 1900, pp. 217–260.

(*j*) Another paper well worth reading in this connexion is in the form of a pamphlet entitled "The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration not Invalidated," and was published in New York in 1905.

(*k*) An article in P Th R, 1910, pp. 560–612, entitled: "Scripture: The Scriptures," in which it is shown that the contention of those scholars is baseless who have taught that "Scripture" in the singular means in the New Testament a particular passage of the Old Testament Scriptures.

(*l*) The culminating article in this series on Inspiration occurs in I S B E, published in 1914. It is the rich fruitage of a lifelong meditation on the subject of Inspiration on the part of a theologian of the very first rank.

Looking over this series of articles, one makes bold to say that not in the whole range of Christian literature will one find the exegetical facts, upon which the doctrine of the plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures rests, brought out so fully and established after so severely scientific a manner as they are brought to light in the foregoing articles on Inspiration by Professor Warfield. I submit that his work on Inspiration on this account marks in this department of theology an epoch. From the character of his research he was entitled to say, as on one occasion he did say: "Destructive criticism is great and vigorous: it is learned and acute: it may possibly have just cause for its open contempt for the learning of the defenders of the Bible's trustworthiness. But it does not reckon sufficiently with one fact. It has the Bible itself against it, and the Bible is always with us. When these criticisms have been forgotten, the Bible will still be read."

Let me refer now to some of the doctrines of the Christian

system to which Professor Warfield made valuable contributions, and indicate where they may be found.

4. God. On this, the subject matter of theology as a science, one will find:

(*a*) A valuable, if comparatively brief and compressed article in D D B, *sub voce* "*Dei.*"

(*b*) An article of interest on the theme of "Godhead" was contributed by him to I S B E.

(*c*) "Calvin's Doctrine of God," P Th R 1909, pp. 381–436.

(*d*) "Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God," N.Y., 1909.

5. The Trinity.

(*a*) The one article which formally deals with this the greatest of all mysteries, as a revealed Christian doctrine, was contributed to I S B E. I was going to say that it was worthy of its subject, but of that it must infinitely fall short. Yet it is monumental, and worthy of Warfield's reputation as a theologian.

(*b*) The article on "Antitrinitarianism" in N Sch H.

6. Predestination.

(*a*) The fundamental article here is that on "Predestination" contributed to H D B, which not only deals with predestination in the general sense of the doctrine of the decree—cosmical predestination—but also with the Bible doctrine of election, a particular application of the general doctrine of the decree to the matter of the dealings of God with sinful men. The article is a masterly survey of the whole Biblical material. To Professor Warfield, the doctrine of Predestination in the cosmical sense seemed the logical outcome of the fundamental Biblical doctrine of theism.

(*b*) The volume entitled "The Plan of Salvation," published in 1915, consists of five lectures, and, in the main, is

an exposition of the order of the decrees as the subject is conceived by Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Supralapsarians, Infralapsarians, Postredemptionists, and Arminians.

(*c*) "Election": Phila. Pres. Brd. Pub.

(*d*) "Predestination in the Reformed Confessions," P R R 1901.

7. Creation.

(*a*) "Calvin's Doctrine of Creation": P Th R, 1915, pp. 190, 125.

(*b*) On "The Antiquity and Unity of the Human Race": P Th R, pp. 1–25.

(*c*) On "The Present-day Conception of Evolution": Emporia, Kansas.

8. Sin.

(*a*) On the subject of sin, one may refer to a brief but very profound article in B S, December, 1900, on "The Principle of the Incarnation," the doctine taught being that sin was the occasion of the Incarnation, and must have been included in God's decree.

(*b*) The subject of indwelling sin is largely the theme of the series of articles which Warfield published on Perfectionism to which we shall again refer; and the fact of sin is the *prius* of all his discussions relative to election.

9. The two subjects to which Dr. Warfield felt drawn most of all, if one may judge by the number of his contributions to the several themes which go to form our Christian system, were the Inspired Word and the Word Incarnate. To the former of these themes I have already referred. I now would point to some articles of value that Dr. Warfield contributed on the subject of the Word Incarnate.

(*a*) Here again, the fundamental article is that on "The Son of God," contributed to I S B E *sub voce*. The material of this article are the exegetical facts, and the *stadia* in the development of the theme are in terms of the Divine Nature,

the human nature, the complex Person of Immanuel, Kenotism.

(*b*) With this should be read an article on "The Deity of Christ" which was contributed to the series known as "Fundamentals."

(*c*) Then there is Dr. Warfield's "Lord of Glory," an 8vo volume of 304 pp.

(*d*) The article on "Foresight" in H D C.

(*e*) The article on "Jesus Christ" in N Sch H—a brilliant contribution of the highest apologetical value.

(*f*) A paper on "The Emotional Life of our Lord" in the "Princeton Seminary Theological Studies"—the Centenary Vol., 1912.

(*g*) The article "Amazement" in H D C.

(*h*) The article "Astonishment" in that same Dictionary.

(*i*) The article "Children" in that same Dictionary. It is an article engaged to answer two questions: What Jesus did for children? Wherein does the childlikeness whereby alone the Kingdom of God can be received, consist?

(*j*) "Jesus' alleged Confession of Sin": P Th R 1914, pp. 177–228.

(*k*) "Misconception of Jesus and Blasphemy of the Son of Man": the same Rev., pp. 367–410.

(*l*) "The Two Natures, and recent Christological Speculations": A J Th 1911, pp. 337–360.

(*m*) "Late Discussions of Kenosis": P R R, 1899, pp. 700–725.

(*n*) "Christless Christianity": H Th R 1912, pp. 423–473.

10. The Atonement.

(*a*) A very characteristic article on "The Atonement" in N Sch H.

(*b*) "Christ our Sacrifice": P Th R 1917, pp. 385–422.

(*c*) The article "Redemption" in H D B.

(*d*) "Redeemer and Redemption": P Th R 1916, p. 177.

(*e*) "Modern Theories of the Atonement": P Th R 1903, pp. 81–92.

(*f*) "Christianity and the Cross of Christ": H Th R 1914, pp. 538–594.

11. On the work of the Spirit: (*a*) "Renewal," P Th R 1911, pp, 242–267. (*b*) Cf. N Sch H on "Renewal."

12. Faith.

(*a*) An Article on "Faith" in H D B. It is a fine instance of Warfield's method of combining exegesis and historical development with dogmatic statement. I should be very much surprised if an evangelical minister could read this article without much profit.

(*b*) "Faith in its Psychological Aspects": P Th R 1911, pp. 537–566.

13. "Imputation": N Sch H.

14. "Doubt": H B D.

15. "The Confessions of Augustine": P Th R 1905, pp. 81–126.

16. "The Sabbath": Adshead, Glasgow.

17. Baptism.

(*a*) "Baptism": N Sch H.

(*b*) "The Archæology of the Mode of Baptism": Bibl S, vol. liii., No. 212.

(*c*) "How shall we Baptise?" M R Q, Oct., 1911.

(*d*) "Christian Baptism": Philadelphia, 1920.

(*e*) "The Polemics of Infant Baptism": The P Q, vol. xiii.

18. "Annihilationism": N Sch H.

IV. Historics. In what concerns the history of doctrine Dr. Warfield was singularly well read and his powers of exposition were almost unique. In that connexion I mention here:

(1) "Tertullian and the Beginning of the Doctrine of the

Trinity": P Th R 1905, 529 f.; 1906, 1 f.; 1906, 145 f.

(2) "Augustine's Doctrine of Knowledge and Authority": P Th R 1907, pp. 353 f. and 529 f.

(3) "Augustine": H E R E—a most readable and suggestive contribution. No extra-biblical personality appealed to Warfield as did Augustine. The Article in H E R E enables us in a sense to measure the *stadia* of theological developments in terms of Augustine.

(4) "Calvin's Doctrine of the Trinity": P Th R 1909, 553–652.

(5) "Jonathan Edwards": H E R E.

(6) A volume entitled "Two Studies in the History of Doctrine"—

(*a*) "Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy," and (*b*) "The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation." New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1897.

(7) Perfectionism.

(*a*) There are those articles which deal with Wesley's doctrine of Perfection, and of the natural development of that doctrine, in terms of Boardman, Robert Pearsall Smith, Charles G. Trumbull: P Th R, July 1918; October 1918; January 1919.

(*b*) Articles dealing with "Oberlin Perfectionism," four articles in all, which will be found in P Th R for January, 1921; April, 1921; July, 1921; October, 1921.

(*c*) Three articles on "John Humphrey Noyes and his Bible Communists": Bibl S 1921, pp. 37–72; pp. 172–200; pp. 319–375.

(*d*) Four articles on "The Mystical Perfectionism of Thomas Cogswell Upham"—(and his followers)—an unsavoury lot: U S R, vol. xxxii., pp. 89–123, 275–298, and vol. xxxiii., pp. 45–65.

(*e*) Perhaps the most permanently valuable in this

remarkable series are those entitled "'Miserable Sinner Christianity' in the hands of the Rationalists": P Th R, April, 1920; July, 1920; October, 1920. Add to these: "Ritschl and his doctrine of Perfection": P Th R, 1919–1920.

(8) "The 'Ninety-five Theses' in their Theological Significance": P Th R 1917, pp. 501–529.

(9) "Calvinism": N Sch H.

(10) "The Literary History of Calvin's Institutes": P P R, 1899, pp. 193–249.

(11) "Predestination in the Reformed Churches": P R R 499–129.

(12) "Calvin as a Theologian and Calvinism To-day." Three addresses. Phila.: The Presbyterian Board of Publication.

(13) "John Calvin—the Man and his Work": M Q R, October, 1909.

(14) "The Literary History of the Institutes of the Christian Religion by John Calvin." Phila.: 1909.

(15) "The Latest Phases of Historical Rationalism": P Q.

V. Symbolics.

(1) "The Significance of the Westminster Standards as a Creed"—an address.

(2) "The Making of the Westminster Confession and especially its chapter on the Decree of God:" P R R, 1901, pp. 22–283.

(3) "The Printing of the Westminster Confession": P R R, 1901, pp. 606–659; 1902, pp. 60–120, and 254–276 and 380–426, and 557–587.

(4) "The First Question of the Shorter Catechism": P Th R, 1908, 565–587.

(5) "On the Revision of the Confession of Faith," N.Y., 1890.

(6) "Shall we Revise the Confession of Faith?" Trenton, N.J., 1889.

(7) "The Confession of Faith as Revised in 1903": a pamphlet.

VI. Homiletics.

(1) "Incarnate Truth": Princeton Sermons, 1893.

(2) "The Gospel of the Incarnation": two Sermons. N.Y., 1893.

(3) "The Power of God unto Salvation": eight sermons. Phila.: Pres. Brd. Pub.

(4) "The Saviour of the World": nine sermons. Hodder & Stoughton.

(5) "Faith and Life": forty-one Sermonettes. Longmans, Green & Co.

VII. Miscellanea.

(1) "The Encyclopædia Biblica and its Critical Principles."

(2) "Dream": H D C G, *sub voce*.

(3) "Sanctifying the Pelagians": P Th R, 1903, pp. 457–462.

(4) "Spiritual Culture in the Theological Seminary": P Th R, 1804, pp. 65–87.

(5) "Are there few that be saved?": L C H R.

(6) "Hymns and Religious Verses": Phila., 1910.

(7) An almost innumerable number of Reviews of books and short articles will be found in P R R, P Th R, B S and J B L, almost every one of which contains suggestions which to the theological student are of the highest value.

Let us hope that some day we shall have a uniform and complete edition of the works of Benjamin B. Warfield. He certainly deserves to be counted among the most distinguished teachers of the Church of God.

John R. Mackay.

## *THE CALL OF AMOS.*

UNLIKE the greater prophets, the lesser contain nothing that can be described as the direct record of a call. The beginning of the story of Jonah is no true exception to the rule. But Amos at least refers to his own call (vii. 15), and the manner in which he does so shows that he attached great importance to it. Is it possible to find a record in what he has left us of the experiences which sent him on his sombre and epoch-making mission?

In chapters vii., viii. and ix. we have the account of five visions. Many of the prophets describe visions—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel and Zechariah; though not, it may be noted, either Hosea or Micah. It is often, however, difficult to draw the line between what the prophets saw, and what, to judge from the constant expression "thus saith Jahveh," they claimed to have heard. The word *hāzāh*, "saw," is at all events apparently used of the origin, and of the contents, of the prophetic word or message,[1] and when we have the account of a conversation between Jahveh and the prophet,[2] as in Jeremiah or Habakkuk, it is not unreasonable to suppose something more than mere audition.

The relation between sight and hearing in these exalted moments is a question for the psychologists; but it is clear, none the less, that the prophets did make a distinction between these two modes of revelation; and equally clear that to Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, visions of some special character marked their call. Whatever the reason for the present arrangement, Isaiah vi. describes the begin-

[1] Thus the whole prophecy of Isaiah is headed "The vision which Isaiah saw" (Isa. i. 1). Cf. Isa. ii. 1, Amos i. 1.

[2] Jer. xv., Hab. i. 12–ii. 4.

ning of the prophet's definite ministry. And that something was seen by Jeremiah and Ezekiel is unmistakeable.

As it stands, the book of Amos, excluding the final and eschatological prophecy of future blessing (ix. 11–15), contains four addresses, chapters i. and ii. on the surrounding nations, ending with Israel itself; iii.–vi., general destruction; vii., autobiographical (including three visions); and viii., ix., addresses which are introduced by visions. But it is clear that the vision of chapter viii. belongs to the three in chapter vii. In fact, the four visions are really two pairs of visions. The first two are exactly parallel; "thus Jahveh God showed me"; two great and menacing natural calamities; two prayers for mercy (almost in the same words, with the pathetic use of the name "Jacob"); and Jahveh's "repentance."

The parallel between the third and fourth visions is nearly as close. "Thus He showed me"; the object (quite a common one) that is seen; Jahveh's question ("what do you see?") and the prophet's answer; and the pronouncement of the calamity which the object suggests. Here there is no intercession. The fifth vision (ch. ix.) is different; Jahveh is seen standing by the altar in the temple court; He utters a terrible command, whose actual carrying out is not related; and He continues in a sustained speech of doom.

How then did the series of four come to be broken by the Amaziah incident (vii. 10–17)? It is possible, as has several times been suggested, that Amos was narrating his visions, and that when he came to the mention of Jeroboam, the patience of the priest was exhausted; he reported the matter to the court, and got rid of the intrusive seer from Judah. But against this are the facts that the Amaziah incident is told in the third person, while the visions are told in the first; and that the narration of the fourth

vision is then left, so to speak, in the air. On the other hand, the insertion of the Amaziah incident by an arranger or editor after the third vision can easily be explained; for the third vision ends with the reference to Jeroboam (the one instance where the name is mentioned by Amos), and a Jewish editor, having to fit in somewhere the section which dealt with Jeroboam, would find this a natural place. It is well known that the arrangement of sections of Old Testament books by Jewish redactors often rests on external resemblance. A good example is to be found in Jeremiah. xx., xxi., xxii.; Jeremiah xx. and xxi. are apparently placed together because, in spite of the difference in date, they both contain references to Pashhur; xxii. 1–3 echoes xxi. 11, 12; and the rest of xxii. contains elegies on the different successors of Josiah.[1]

That the visions refer to the call of Amos has been suggested by Meinhold, H. P. Smith, Harper, and Hölscher; also by Horton and Canney; for the most part the Germans are silent on the matter. If, however, there is such a reference, what is its relation to vii. 15 ("Jahveh took me as I followed the flock")? In the three major experiences, where a vision constituted the call, there is, with Isaiah and Ezekiel, in spite of divergences, a distinct common element; in each instance, something seen convinces the youth of his mission to announce ruin to a sinful community. Ezekiel, it seems, was thrown into a trance by a striking sunset; something equally impressive must have occurred to Isaiah in the court of the temple. The call of Jeremiah is at once simpler and more progressive. He heard a message; he felt his mouth touched (by Jahveh Himself), and then the sight of two common objects (an

[1] Compare also Ps. xxxii. 11, xxxiii. 1. Ps. lxxviii. naturally follows the close of Ps. lxxvii. The question, "Why is a section where it is?" is not much less important than the question "where ought it to be?"

almond or "early waking" tree and a boiling pot) completed the effect of what had already been said. While Isaiah and Ezekiel both suggest psychic experiences, Jeremiah's matter of fact narrative implies that the sight of the tree and the pot brought to his mind convictions so strong that he felt them to have been spoken by a voice which could only be divine.

But those convictions rested on another which had been formed previously; namely, that he had been "sanctified" and appointed before his birth. Now, if we turn to Amos, the second pair of visions very curiously anticipates those of Jeremiah. The introductory clause is wanting in Jeremiah (though it occurs later on in xxiv. 1, where the use made of the baskets of figs reminds us of the use made of Amos' "summer fruits").[1] But the visions of both prophets refer to what any one might see during a walk in the country; both hear a question from Jahveh, both return an answer and receive a prediction by Jahveh (starting with a play on thought or even on words) of inevitable doom. Such resemblances can hardly be accidental.

What then of the first pair of visions?[2] There is nothing like them in Jeremiah, or in any of the prophetic writings. Before Amos was ready to see the inner suggestiveness of common things, his mind had to be aroused by something more dramatic. The visions must refer to two actual and terrible calamities, locusts and a drought. As any man would do, he prays that their worst consequences may be averted. They are averted. As naturally, he concludes that his prayer is answered, in each instance. But the deep and tragic impression on his mind has done its work. Israel has escaped twice; but such forgiveness, for so

[1] Amos vii. 7, 8, viii. 1–3; Jer. i. 11–15.
[2] Amos vii. 1–6.

guilty a nation, cannot be final, and the sight of a badly built wall and of a basket of fruit brings these thoughts to a head; Israel is doomed. Jeremiah did not need these preliminary shocks; but he needed the direct intimation that he had been personally chosen. May we not conclude that Amos, like any other prophet, would need it too? If so, he seems to have had it. Chapter vii. 15 ("Jahveh took me as I followed the flock") can best be understood as precisely such an intimation as Jeremiah received, and has reported at greater length, in i. 4–9.

Whether this "taking" occurred at the same time as any of the visions cannot be decided. We do not know at what intervals of time the three events in Jeremiah i. occurred. In any case, the four visions of Amos, from "the royal mowings" to the basket of fruit, must have been spread over a whole summer; indeed, the description of the drought in the second vision would suggest that for that year at least there would be no fruit at all. But this does not prevent the real unity of the experience, either with Jeremiah or with Amos.

A study of the various "call" narratives shows that the keynote of the subsequent prophecies was given in the call, but not the details. In the calls of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel the fact that the most important part of their prophecies was not mentioned gives the record all the more credibility. Amos' four visions convey ideas which dominate his first six chapters. Even Jahveh's readiness, up to a point, to forgive (absent from the calls of the three greater prophets) is represented (v. 4, 6, 14, 15; and iv. 6–11 certainly implies that if the nation had "returned," it would have found forgiveness).

The sudden intrusion of a detailed reference in the third vision ("the house of Jeroboam") [1] is a real but not an

[1] Amos vii. 9.

insuperable difficulty. Such details, as far as we know, were never given in any actual "call" experiences. But we may well suppose, as the text suggests, that Amos, faced by growing opposition in Samaria and Bethel, fell back, for his own encouragement and the confutation of his foes, on his memories of his call, and interpreted the unforgotten words in the light of later experiences. Similarly, in his defence before Agrippa against the charge of betraying the sacred cause to the Gentiles, Paul enlarged the simpler words spoken to him on the road to Damascus (Acts xxiv. 17, 18).

It only remains to consider briefly the fifth vision (chap. ix.). This is clearly independent of the foregoing, both in form and subject-matter. Instead of Jahveh's showing something to the prophet, and following this with an action, or with a question and an explanation, the prophet simply sees Jahveh standing and hears Him speak. The tone of the passage reminds one of the vision in Ezekiel ix.; but there Jahveh is accompanied by six men, who carry out His terrible bidding (*vv.* 6–8, 11). Here, Jahveh, as always by Amos and by Jeremiah, is seen alone, and the actual performance of the order is not mentioned. The speech is much longer than in the previous visions, and, unless *vv.* 5–7 are additions, contains like them words both of Jahveh and of the prophet (cf. also *v.* 8).

This vision, too, unlike the others, is located at Bethel, in front of the shrine. The prophet looks at the knobs or finials of the huge pillars before the door—probably "mazzeboth" like Jachin and Boaz outside the shrine at Jerusalem or like the two pillars in Ezekiel's temple—and sees them doomed to crash to the ground; he prolongs his cry of warning, and as his eye still rests on a "caphtor" or finial, he breaks out into the exclamation, "If I brought you from Egypt, this is no more than what I did for the Philis-

tines themselves when I brought them from Caphtor (Crete),[1] or for your foes the Syrians, whom I brought from Kir." And the speech and (it would seem) the recorded prophecies of Amos end with the guillotine-like blow of *v.* 8a, "The eyes of Jahveh God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth."

To sum up. The prophet's history, so far as we can gather it from his hints, is as follows. While engaged in his calling in Judah, he becomes convinced that he is intended by Jahveh to carry a prophetic message to the Northern kingdom. Two great disasters make him dread that the ruin which he knows he must predict is at hand. His worst fears are not fulfilled; but later on, in two simple and, as they might have been termed, every-day experiences, he receives his orders to deliver the message. While he is doing this at Bethel, the opposition which his preaching has roused leads him to describe his credentials, and, in one particular, he gives a pointed application to Jahveh's original commission. He is ordered to leave the country by the chief official of the temple establishment; but before he departs, he falls for a moment into a kind of ecstasy, and then proclaims that the temple itself and the nation which has relied on its unhallowed rites will fall in utter ruin.

*Note.* There is nothing to prove that the experience of vii. 15 ("Jahveh took me") did not follow the visions. But in favour of its preceding them, we have (i) the striking parallel in the call of Jeremiah, and (ii) the fact that the visions themselves seem to imply that the call has already come. It is not impossible, however, that in the words "Jahveh took me" the experience of the four visions themselves is briefly summed up.

W. F. Lofthouse.

[1] Cf. the plays on words previously noted in Amos viii. 2, Jer. i. 12; also Aesch. *Ag.* 689; Soph. *Aj.* 430, and Shakesp. *Rich.* II. Act. ii. Sc. 1.

## *THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.*

It is by considering the revelation of the Fatherhood of God in Christianity that we see best how it is related to other religions, and how it satisfies to the full the irrepressible yearnings and questionings in man, to which all religions bear witness. The religion of Christ takes its place as the completion and apex of all religions because Christ teaches definitely and fully by His Personality and words and life and death that God is Father. "I believe in God the Father" is then the characteristic formula of Christianity, the one statement in which all dogmas and creeds are implicit, the great standard by which all other beliefs must be measured, the one sure corrective of false doctrine. As mathematics may be seen to be the consequence of one or two simple laws—so the Christian Faith is the outcome of God's Fatherhood; it is all unrolled out of it, for it is implied in it—whether it be the Incarnation, Redemption or faith in Immortality. And a true doctrine of the faith can no more contradict this central and all-comprehending doctrine than a true law of nature can conflict with the law of gravity.

We will dwell then upon the Fatherhood of God here as the full and complete satisfaction of all the wants and needs of man's heart and mind, that have been scantily satisfied according to his state of development by the partial and fragmentary revelations of Himself which God has given even to the most barbarous and backward of His people on the earth.

We will not labour to prove that religion is universal. We may take it as an undoubted fact that no race of men exists, or has existed, without some dim and imperfect sense

of the Unseen, without some prayer, ritual, and vague beginnings of theology. Man is not man unless he is religious. To look out of himself, to peer behind the veil of the material world is a faculty of man as man.

What is the chief constituent in this universal sense of God? Is it fear, or trust? If we think of our far-off ancestors with their unprotected bodies and undeveloped minds, placed in a world of unexplained natural changes, terrified by the storm, struck by the lightning, swept away by the flood, shaken by ague, and torn asunder by wild beasts, we are inclined to think religion must have been associated with fear. But there is abundant evidence for the other side. God explained Himself to the trustful side of man in the productive powers of nature, in soft rain and pleasant sunshine, in growth and fertility. He became a comrade at the social sacrifice. As a far-off progenitor of the tribe or clan in the dim Beyond He smiled benediction. As the spirit in the Totem he enbodied the spirit of clanship, and went forth to battle with their armies. Trust, social fellowship, common interest, dependence for help—these are found in most early religions—and they are the foundations of the demands in human nature for a position of sonship, which can only ultimately be satisfied by the full revelation of the Fatherhood of God. There are deep voices in man crying for pity, there are hands outstretched ready to cling to some one that is unseen—there is all the material of a trustful sonship.

Next as man develops Morality emerges more and more. Duty to parent, duty to children, duty to fellow-clansmen, all spring out of the natural environment, yet all are somehow connected with the great spirit, or spirits. It was the sign of growth and health in a people when their religion became more and more penetrated by moral ideals, when it shook off more and more the immoral legends and alle-

gories, and saw that the great spirit must be perfectly good ; it was the sign of the truest progress when the ideal of the Holy God who required right-doing and would punish evil-doing sprang up before the minds of the Hebrews. The God of Nature, the God of the tribe identified with the God of right absolutely and for ever—that is the great gift of the Hebrew people to the world. Now here we must recognise that the God thus more completely discovered or revealed is seen on the sterner side with more forbidding attributes, and in an atmosphere of awe and majesty, but these attributes are still those of Fatherhood.

We have then constituents of trust and kinship, dependence and social feeling uniting sooner or later with the sense of obligation, in the early sense of God.

But as man has gone on his way he has developed his primitive ideas often on wrong lines : he has above all perverted and corrupted his religious notions. Hence the sense of sonship has often been lost, and religion has sanctioned what morality condemns. One religion like Mahometanism has emphasised the arbitrary will of the Divine Being, so that He is Father no longer. Another like Brahmanism merges His Personality in the universe. Another splits up his Unity in the diversities of polytheism or pluralism.

Another is dualistic and sets up beside the principle of good another principle of evil. Yet in all religions there remains something of the trust, the dependence, the cry for satisfaction, which is really the call of the child for its parent.

Now Christianity marvellously satisfies the religious instincts of mankind in its revelation of the Father. If we are to be sons of God in any real sense, the Father must be made known to us by a real son. And therefore the Incarnation of the Son of God is the only path to a full and realised sonship for men. If Christ be the Son of God, He is the

assured Way to the Father. And it is without doubt His wonderful revelation of the Father, summing up and completing all that man had so long been blindly and imperfectly striving after, that really is the best evidence that He is the Son of God. If we can grasp the character of His revelation of the Father in all its fulness, we shall not want to look elsewhere for the evidence of his tremendous claims. His consciousness of Himself as son of God—in the Temple, in the home, in the desert, in the storm, in the Judgment Hall and on the Cross, and His power of extending that consciousness to other men—are these not proof enough that His message is real, and His account of the Father true ?

If we strive to analyse this consciousness of the Father in Christ, and in a paler degree in his disciples, these characteristics emerge. i. God is intensely *Personal.* He is no sum of laws or centre of forces but at least all that we mean by a Person. We have only to read the Sermon on the Mount to feel how vividly the fatherly care of God as a personal agent is realised.

ii. God as Father is *akin to man.* Here the truth comes in to justify the dim guesses of primitive men. " We are His offspring," in the sense that we are part of His visible creation, the heathen poet could see. " He is our Father " the Christian understands in a higher sense, for we share His spirit, and the true life that is not seen is really the gift of the father to the child. The word " Father " teaches us that it is the nature of God to communicate Himself, to originate new centres of consciousness, which shall have a personality that, under such limitations as He wills, shall be a reflection of His own. God giving Himself in new forms of existence, ever immanent, yet ever transcendent—that is part of what is meant by the Fatherhood. We see here how the Fatherhood safeguards both God's

Personality, and our own. The idea of the family relationship excludes any thought of absorption in the Godhead. It is true to the first assurances of our human minds, that we are self-existent units with a life of our own, that we cannot merge our responsibilities in fate or God. It is true also to the other side, the dim feeling that though persons we are still dependent on some great Reality, from which we spring, and in whom we live and move. Both must be justified by the complete religion, or man is only half explained. And the Fatherhood holds God and man duly apart as surely as it draws them together.

iii. The sense of the Fatherhood includes *the realisation of an end* which God has for His children. The God who is Personal and akin to man also intends man to follow a certain course and attain certain heights. We will not enter on the tangled discussion of predestination, but only let us notice how the very word Father calls up in St. Paul's mind, for instance, the thought of heirship as well as sonship. And heirship means receiving all that is best from Him who called us into being. How safely and how trustfully may we live our life in the thought of that Father's intentions for us and our growth, if we only have faith and co-operate with His purposes.

"And because ye are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba, Father'. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God" (Gal. iv. 6, 7).

iv. Once more, even the pressure of duty is stronger under the care of a father than under the rule of a sovereign. The sin of a son is worse than the sin of a slave. Carry the idea of a sovereign to its logical end, and you have one who upholds his will by penalty. Carry the idea of a father out to the full, and you have one who in perfect fatherhood dispenses with punishment and rules by love. So as we

escape from lower ideas of God and as we appreciate better the meaning of fatherhood, the force of obligation increases as well. And at last we understand that the Parable of the Prodigal Son says the last word on what sin is. It is not disobedience to a sovereign, but it is turning one's back upon a Father, it is falsifying all His intentions, it is preferring another home to His.

v. We have but to look at any true specimen of the Christian life to see also that there we have the flower of all the early search for an unseen stay amid all the darkness of life. That was the child calling for its parent. The Gospel of the Fatherhood is the response. And so Christianity has to shew a wonderful array of the simple and trustful elements in character. The gentle story of the love of God in Christ, and the revelation of Him as Father, as men understand fatherhood, has made trust and loving dependence not the rare exceptions in life here and there, but the secret of happiness more and more realised by normal souls. The children of faith are countless as the sand, numberless as the stars of heaven, and faith in man could be drawn out by no other name so strongly as "*Father.*" Perhaps no side of religion is more universally seen among the humble than this simple trust in the fatherly love of God.

Such are the salient features of the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God taught by our Lord Jesus Christ. It shines forth in His words and life with the glow of the love of Him "who so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son." Man's surrender and the Father's love are both sealed in blood in the death of Jesus. We are quite willing, therefore, to regard the realisation of this doctrine as it expresses itself in Christ and in His followers as the chief evidence for the truth of Christianity.

Indeed its evidential value can hardly be exaggerated.

We take man as he is in all degrees of development. We always find this dimly-felt resting on the Unseen, which we call religion. Man looks in his best moments to something higher, better, wiser than himself. His God is ever personal; he feels a kinship with the Divine, that is above and around Him. He feeds His altar with the food he loves himself; he propitiates Him with human praise. He finds in due course the seat of Right and Justice in the throne of His God, and draws from Him a sanction for human law. Amid the blows of pain and sorrow he ever recurs to the thought of that figure behind the scenes of life, and gains his only solace from the assurance that it is His will that suffering should be. Do not all these human instincts demand from the nature of things their satisfaction? Are they not a concave, which requires a convex the other side? Was it strange that some dim suggestion of a Father-God arose from time to time in the thoughts of wise men?

And when Christ appears with the name Father on His lips, and the sense of perfect sonship in His heart, and draws in living lines the picture of the Father, and gives in divine words the message of the Father; and it is found that from every aspect it not only meets, but far more than meets, the highest and the most earnest and the most pathetic cries of man's heart, as he sought to find out God, shall we not say, "God has revealed Himself as He is to the child which He made capable of receiving His revelation"? That heart pierced by arrows, that mind perplexed and curious as to destiny and duty, the yearning and the weariness which make up the pathos of the ancient world, the immense need of a father in man's deepest self, some one to depend on and trust for ever—there is the first premise in the argument; and the second is the Father revealed in Jesus Christ, creating men out of love, feeding, teaching, and bearing with them who use so ill the great gift of free-

will which He gave, sending the Son of His love to bring back into conformity to His will the world that had gone astray. There in the tenderness and lovingkindness, aye in the sacrifice and humiliation, as well as in the stern holiness and awe that would not brook sin unpunished—there is the answer written in full to the question that man had ever asked, to which he had received till then but partial and fragmentary replies—"Who is this other than myself, mysteriously akin to myself, whom as a Friend, and as a Judge in love and mercy I dimly feel to be with my spirit behind the shows of sense and time?"

W. J. Ferrar.

## *THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD MEDIATED BY FORGIVENESS.*

Reflection on the forgiveness of sins, in the Bible, passes through three chief stages, which in their main characteristics may be described as those of the prophets, of Jesus, and of St. Paul. Prophets and psalmists undoubtedly laid hold of pardon, but in their consciousness of it a certain precarious element lingers. It was, so to speak, provisional. The index of its reality tended to lie, at least partly, in outward felicity, just as on the other hand the man for whom calamity had given place to joy was *eo ipso* convinced that his transgression had been taken away. But a great personal disaster shook certainty to the foundations. It seemed to prove beyond dispute that the sinner had been rejected by God. "Why hast Thou cast me off?" is the appeal flung to the skies by the believer on whom evil days had fallen. I do not think it reasonable to dismiss this kind of religion, half-scornfully, as merely prudential. The psalmists were as far from being utilitarians as any men who ever lived. Doubtless they were wrong when they found the mark of Divine favour in individual or national prosperity, yet in the deepest sense of all were they simply wrong? Jesus Himself conceived the Kingdom of God as an order of things, a world-dispensation, in which the loving omnipotence of God has free course, and the realms alike of spirit and nature are one in absolute perfection. When we use the word "heaven," we are thinking of the same thing. We are thinking of "the changeless prime of body and of soul," a perfect society in a perfected environment, with God over all. Old Testament believers were but antedating that ideal when they claimed that goodness and happiness should go

together, and felt faith totter as the good man sank in affliction.

Somehow this problem of theodicy does not torment the apostolic writers : the New Testament contains nothing like the Book of Job. For reason the problem is not solved, but it is solved for faith. In Christ they have had a view of God which is conclusive, and suffering no longer jars their certainty of pardon. This implies that thought regarding forgiveness has come to rest on and revolve round the fully known character of God. When men rejoice over pardon with joy unspeakable and full of glory, it is because of what they have discovered God to be. That is to say, the experience of being forgiven brings out into new and solemn clearness some great aspects of God's character. One or two of these are worth careful study.

## I.

To begin with, the forgiven man knows that only God can forgive, and He can forgive in none but personal ways. Self-absolution is impracticable. It is true, men not infrequently have tried to deal with their own sin by absolving themselves, by making apology as it were to their own higher nature, and in turn accepting that apology. They have sought to reconcile their own heart to its guilty woes by registering the fact that they condemn what they have done and are resolved not to do it again. There are grounds in the human mind for believing that this cannot satisfy. To pardon his own sin cannot, to one of enlightened conscience, afford a real and deep sense of being reconciled with righteousness, for he is not righteous. No man who at all admits his wrong-doing will go on to identify himself in this direct sense with the righteous order of the world. He is at variance with that order, and to bring himself into unity with it by an act of will is as impossible as to lift himself up

by his shoulder-straps. The method, however, is a hopeless one for dealing with the corruption of man's heart. This corruption the sinner either owns or denies. If he owns it, his case is the more desperately incurable by his private powers; if he denies it, his sin is the deeper for his lack of candour.

In other cases, men have asked forgiveness from each other. They have acknowledged the fault to the injured one, and sought relief through unreserved confession. Up to a point there is virtue in this plan, but the pity is, many sins are all but irrelevant to relationships with our neighbour. They do not invade another's personality. Evil thought, worldliness, irreverence of course have a real bearing on society and our contribution to its warfare, but it would be difficult to single out any one friend whose pardon we could ask on their account, at all events without the feeling that we were somehow playing a part. He would be at least as much startled as ourselves if we craved his pardon, say, for a disorderly imagination.

These are but half-way measures: they are like sprinkling rose-water on an ulcer. For the Christian, indeed for the man who without being a Christian holds that Christianity is true, they fall away, and to call them inadequate is a mild expression. He knows that no hope exists for him except as there is One to whom he can go directly, with the words: "Father, I have sinned in Thy sight."

## II.

Again, the forgiven man is acutely conscious of the Personality of God. If proof were insisted on, I should have to quote one half of the Psalter. Unless God be a personal Spirit, who hears and understands and answers prayer, the sinful man who comes yearning for reconciliation is of necessity as much disconcerted as if, to use Newman's famous

illustration, he were to look into a mirror and not see his own face.

This, it cannot be too strongly said, is a point of crucial importance. It is in the strict sense fundamental: it must be laid down as a foundation-stone of all profitable thought upon the subject. If I am engaged in a discussion of the possibility of forgiveness, or its meaning, with one who denies that God is personal in the sense that He can have personal relations with us, I know from the outset that our arguments and counter-arguments can never meet. They are moving in different planes, and unless we are out purely for logical exercise, the debate might just as well be called off at the start. Discussion about constitutional government with a true-blue anarchist, to whom all government is anathema, could not be more in vain than reasoning on forgiveness with one to whom God is anything but a self-conscious person.

Is not this why a book of philosophy so seldom prepares the mind for insight into the forgiveness of sins? We search vainly in works of metaphysics or even moral theory for any serious approach to some issues which concern the passionately religious man, such as the hearing of prayer, pardon, or the acquisition of power to be good. This may perhaps be explained quite simply. After all, the predominant stream of philosophical tradition has relatively little positive teaching, or none at all, with regard to the personal being of God. Even Plato hesitates. Aristotle, the Stoics, Scotus Erigena, Bruno, Spinoza, Hegel—they are all concerned to speak of what may much more justly be described as the Absolute than as God. Now you may speculate on the Divine, dream of the Divine, aspire to the Divine, lose yourself in the Divine without ever raising this problem or even after deciding it in the negative; but you can ask for pardon only if the Divine be a holy, loving,

conscious Spirit. It is as a Person that He claims us, rebukes us, comforts us ; in particular, it is as a person that He forgives sin. In his recent Gifford Lectures Mr. C. C. J. Webb writes, in criticism of less adequate views of sin, "I can only declare my conviction that to regard Sin as an offence against a personal authority, and still more to regard it as an affront to a loving Father, is a more intelligible and a more ethically significant way of thinking about it than it is to conceive it after the analogy of a physical defilement or an automatic mechanism." [1] The love of God will lose meaning for the heart in proportion as He ceases to be personal for the intelligence. And it is love we need, and must have at all costs, when we come with the burden of sin.

Hence there is no cure for Pantheism like a fit of penitence. In the language of Amiel's *Journal*: "What tears us away from the enchantments of Maya, is conscience." The man who has faced up to his own badness is in no danger of confusing himself with God. He knows, without reasoning, that God and he are not identical, and that he must stifle conviction before he can adopt the lines :

> "I am the eye with which the Universe
> Beholds itself, and knows itself divine."

Ignore conscience, and it is easy to construct a metaphysical view according to which Pantheism is perfectly simple and satisfactory. Everything, then, is God, and nothing but God exists anywhere—not the intellect or heart of man, not the difference between truth and falsehood or between right and wrong. One touch of contrition breaks the spell. Instantly the personal distinction between God and man stands forth : we awake to the fact that moral law is the will of God, and that in contravening it we have lost touch with

[1] *God and Personality*, p. 250.

the Father. And unless on analysis "Father" includes the idea of personality, does it have any clear sense at all?

## III.

Again, He from whom we receive pardon is, in the great Biblical phrase, the Living God. He is known as One who wills and acts; in forgiving, He produces a change in our relation to Himself. What the plain Christian man is thinking of when he says forgiveness is not primarily an alteration in his own mind; it is something accomplished by God. In religion the central interest always is what God does, and it is He who initiates pardon. In forgiving our sin, He acts towards us, He acts upon us.

Opposition to the idea of a God who veritably acts within the believer's experience has come from two quarters otherwise keenly antagonistic to each other. Thus traditional theology from early times has done a very great deal to suggest a conception of God as the one unchanging Substance, strictly devoid of all attributes and out of positive or direct relation to any time-order. This idea moves down the centuries parallel to the warmer and more living New Testament thought of the Father whose gracious action on our behalf is the source of all hope; and much of the interest of historical theology consists in watching the struggle between these two interpretations. Even the convinced foe of speculative rationalism, Ritschl, as is well known, did homage to speculation rather than faith when he taught that it is a mere subjective appearance when the pardoned man feels that the expression of God's love towards him has changed, in forgiveness, from condemnation to merciful acceptance. He surely is on much firmer ground when he declares, as he does so emphatically, that the Divine act or judgment of forgiveness is a synthetic or creative judgment. But if it is creative, it must produce

a new situation. It is the Father opening the door of communion with Himself and placing the penitent in the position of a reconciled son. It is the love of God depriving our sins of their power to expel us from His fellowship. One who has passed through this regenerating experience will have difficulty in believing that God was not the agent in causing light to rise within him, or that nothing really happened except his wakening from a bad dream to perceive that God and he had never been estranged at all.

Moreover, the act of God in pardoning men is definitely supernatural in quality. Consciously to receive forgiveness is to know that a change has been effected in our relation to the Father which can be accounted for only by His direct interposition. If it be said, as doubtless it may be said with some point, that in the world of love forgiveness is a matter of course, this only throws us back on the marvellous character of a love such that to it forgiveness is natural.

That the view just stated is, in essentials, our Lord's, can hardly be questioned. By His behaviour to the paralytic in Mark ii., He calls attention to the fact that pardon is as miraculous as cure. "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed." His judgment is echoed by the Christian mind. In the pardoned soul, all the pardoned feel, something has occurred which merely psychical forces moving wholly within the mind could not have effected, something so great that it asks for a Divine cause. "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Life has been given a new start. It is not only that the tendencies of character are in principle reversed; that, true as it is, is the result of something else. As a prior condition the burden of past sin—sin that cleaves to us with the warning that it is ours for ever—has been lifted away; by revolutionising mercy we are drawn back to the great

heart of God. Who but He can thus open to us the gates of righteousness? Who but He can knit up the broken strands of union, or say to the aching heart, "I am thy salvation"? Thus in pardon, in the only sense a religious man cares to give the word, God does an act which is decisively supernatural and impossible for any other being—He separates between the sinner and his evil. He abolishes the guilt of sin, not by declaring it to be not sinful, or forgetting it, or letting the sinner off, but by countervailing its power to hinder communion with Himself. The man who comes to God with a load of felt unworthiness may undoubtedly be fiercely tempted to deny the possibility of its removal, and this is the more likely if in any degree he has yielded to that sombre naturalistic pessimism which tells broken men that things must always be with them as they are now, and bids them endure their fate as best they may, with brave dumb stoicism. But in countless instances, as believers know, these misgivings have vanished like smoke in Jesus' presence. At first glance it is unbelievable that God should forgive, yet over and over again He does so. So it dawns upon us that within and above cosmic law there is a Father. In the last resort, we stand to face not impersonal tendencies of nature, but the living God, who in Christ puts forth His hand to grasp ours, and through forgiveness ushers the contrite into a new and boundless world of good.

In the proper sense of the word this is supernatural. It is a transcendent act to which the normal operations and processes of phenomenal reality are irrelevant. It cannot be at all expressed by mechanical relations of inviolable sequence, for it means that God Himself enters our life immediately to inaugurate a new attitude in which He and we shall henceforth stand to each other. Of course the psychologist will have his own account to give. He will

have much that is important to say regarding ways in which the assurance of pardon captures the focus of consciousness, and instals a new reigning system of ideas in the mind. But what the believer is most concerned with lies on another plane. What supremely interests him is the direct fatherly act of God in bestowing the boon of reconciliation. It is indeed part of the definition of forgiveness that it comes solely from the mighty grace of God; it is part of the Christian thought of God that He is the Being who can do this thing. He only can rescue us from the necessities and fatalities of evil in which nature and history appear to entangle us, as if to make free personal life an impossibility. Forgiveness, bestowed by the living God, is the act by which we are really constituted persons—not things, or links in a chain, but free men.

Should we not do well to form our idea of miracle from this point of view? There is a moral order as there is an order we describe as physical. We are to-day the creatures of yesterday, and we are now shaping the to-morrow that will be. "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap" is a text from which imaginative literature has preached with terrible power. Yet this adamant moral order can be entered remedially by God's love, and the experience of forgiveness is there to prove it. By His mercy, men need not reap all they have sown. He is above as well as within these laws. He can use them. He uses them perpetually, but His love in its sovereign might can overflow their narrow bounds; it can intervene to make all things new. He can come near to deal with us personally, approaching so closely that His hand and our hand meet. And for God thus to effect a transforming change in our relation to Himself is a supernatural event whose amazing character is concealed from us solely by that familiarity which too often makes even the Gospel common-place.

There are those in our time who might well find in the adequate analysis of Divine pardon the decisive aid towards a more joyous and triumphant faith in a free and living God who is perpetually present and perpetually at work. Let them inquire anew as to the meaning of what happens when by Divine creative act, their sin is blotted out, and they will realise that what confronts them is, quite seriously, a miracle not in the far distances of ancient history, but in their present lives. God has entered their individual career in a way which neither nature nor human nature can explain, in a power which transcends nature, and for ends which lie beyond it. This is the kind of miracle that lies nearest, for it belongs to experience, and without experience religious ideas are hypotheses and nothing more. Why should we not have courage to say that forgiveness is the uniquely verifiable case of that direct, personal and infinitely varied activity of God to which religious men, and amongst them such as have drunk deepest of the Christian spring, give the name "supernatural." On the spiritual side, it may be manifested in the reconciliation of a sinful man to the Father; on the physical side, just because there is one world and one living Lord of heaven and earth, it may be manifested in similarly unforeseeable ways, as by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. These are works which only God can do. They are works declaratory of the truth that almighty Love is personally active in history and in the world as a whole; and to the objection that they are isolated events we may answer, with Ruskin, that "an energy may be natural without being normal, and Divine without being constant."

## IV.

Let us now pass on to something else. Our aim is to elucidate those qualities in God which are revealed to the

forgiven man, to the man who has this experience of the living God working the wonder of wonders in his own life. We have found that to such a man God is disclosed as personal, and as the Doer of miracle. To this may now be added the further insight reached by way of pardon that His nature is sacrificial love.

In other words, we are unable (as the apostles were) eventually to separate the question of Divine forgiveness from the question of the atonement, i.e., the action of God in reconciling the world to Himself. Not that the two subjects cannot be distinguished and treated so far in abstraction from each other: the thing has often been done. But though a man may receive forgiveness without raising the problem in what sense Christ is involved in its mediation or even feeling that for him this is a problem of vital interest, it is almost certainly different if he should proceed to make forgiveness the subject of sustained reflection and specifically to ask what are its implications for the love of God, on whom the strain of pardon falls. In the New Testament, the grace of God makes on the contrite an impression of absolute and unreserved sacrifice; the pardoned feel that they owe everything to Him. If we have taken this in, and if we have also learnt the lesson that the best things in life are of dearest price, we shall not be able to refrain from putting atonement and forgiveness in a close unity.

Who was the first to describe atonement as the cost of forgiveness to God? I have not succeeded in tracing the idea further back than Horace Bushnell, and his was an intelligence so free and rich that the phrase may well have been his own minting. No one was ever readier to lift the anchor and steer his own way. In *Forgiveness and Law* he writes, with a curious turn of phrase: "Our human instinct puts us always on making cost when we undertake to forgive." At an earlier point, when explaining how atonement

is reached between a good man and an offender, he lays down that true forgiveness demands two things: "first, such a sympathy with the wrong-doing party as virtually takes his nature; and secondly, a making cost in that nature by suffering, or expense, or painstaking sacrifice and labour." This is followed up by two or three affecting and credible examples of how one man can really and spiritually pardon another only in so far as he takes the other's sin upon him in the cost he bears for his sake. It appears to me that this is an exceptionally attractive and rewarding path of approach, with collateral advantages of many kinds. If it be true, as has been said in only too familiar words, that the higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins, the reply made by Dr. Hutton is very much to the point: "If I don't worry about my sins, somebody else has to worry about them all the more." That is a principle worthy to interpret even the relationships of God and man. I could understand a preacher who told his congregation—though the expression might be far below the solemn dignities of dogmatic theology—that atonement was a learned word signifying that Christ, in whom God was present, had worried about our sins so that it brought Him to His grave. It is no poor forgiveness He imparts, but one flowing from unimaginable expenditures of spirit and will.

Hence we may find a key to God's experience in forgiving the sinful if we attempt to realise, even if it be only imaginatively, what happens when a man forgives a great wrong done to himself. As has so often occurred in religious history, the best things in human intercourse turn out to be a window into the life of God. It is clear we must take an instance of great gravity, with something hideous to be pardoned—say the treachery of a friend, bringing disgrace to the injured man and a loss of happiness never quite to be made good in this life. The problem is one which has occa-

sionally been touched in theology and in preaching, but technical moral philosophy has been curiously silent upon it. The present writer asked two of the most eminent philosophers in this country to name any passage in works on moral psychology where this precise matter is discussed, what in such a case goes on in the forgiver's mind and again in the mind of the person forgiven ; yet, although there is in question one of the most tragic of ethical experiences, not a single reference could be given. It is possible that a sufficiently profound student of the Russian novelists, above all Dostoevsky, might aid us at just this point.

Denney has said, in his piercing way, that " there is no such experience in the relations of human beings as a real forgiveness which is painless, cheap, or easy. There is always passion in it on both sides—a passion of penitence on the one side, and the more profound passion of love on the other, bearing the sin of the guilty to win him, through reconciliation, to goodness again." It is on the second side of this relation that we must fasten our thoughts. When by a self-conquest which bystanders feel to be sublime the injured man (or, it may be, woman), refusing to ignore moral realities yet reaching over the wrong to knit up the old bonds of communion, attains to the act of deep pure pardon, the act presupposes and is mediated by costly suffering.

It is an exacting thing to pardon a great wrong ; not with a heart of stone can so brave and loving an act be carried through. A man is conscious of the wrench and agony in proportion as on the one hand he feels the shame of his friend's evil and as on the other sympathy brings him close to the guilty life, actually through intense feeling putting him where the other is. To enter by passionate imagination and self-projection into the other's conflict, to hold by intercession his faltering hand, to weep with his sorrow,

actually to think himself still at the other's side in the loneliness and misery of guilt—how true that in heart and mind he must set out on "voyages of anguish"![1] It is an experience of deep-reaching pain, of vicarious sacrifice. It is the state of a soul under great stress. To the onlooker it may appear as if the suffering were that of wounded pride, of reluctance to face what is at war with memories of old friendship; but it is not so. The man is not pardoning merely because he acknowledges pardon to be his duty, though abhorrent, whereas if a chance offered he would wash his hands of the offender. That were suffering merely from the resented invasion of personality; but this is sacrificial pain. As he moves out to find and claim his friend again the other's evil, as never before, comes in upon him in its infinite repulsiveness and need of cleansing; yet redemptively he takes it upon himself as by a creative substitutionary fellow-feeling, submerging it in love.

If reasons are demanded for what seems, at first sight, the daring plan of taking this as an analogy for Divine forgiveness, its method and intrinsic cost, we must point out that the parallel is in fact natural and convincing. At least the analogy is drawn from "the most sure and sacred things in human experience." But in addition there are two intermediate steps of argument. First, in the Gospels we do see Jesus entering, in just this way, into the lives of sinners by loving communion with their misery. He places Himself beside the guilty: "when He felt the gulf fixed between God and sinners, He thought Himself on our side of the breach and numbered Himself with the transgressors."[2] Secondly, face to face with Jesus we receive the direct impression that the love in virtue of which He does this amazing thing, is positively the love of God Him-

[1] See *The Forgiveness of Sins*, by R. N. Flew.
[2] H. S. Coffin, *Social Aspects of the Cross*, p. 23.

self. What touches and blesses us in the Redeemer's sympathy is the Divine grace that beats and breaks through it upon our life.

Thus if in a profound case of human pardon there is tragedy for both persons concerned—pain forming the necessary vehicle of forgiveness, in an experience where nature is rent asunder—it may well be so likewise between God and man. To us pardon is free because to Him its realisation came through agony. The cross presents God's anguish, an awful grief answering to the greatness of the remitted sin. In Him eternally there is the mind towards the sinful which we behold in the dying Christ. What holy love in God required as a condition of pardon, or rather as a living element of it, was not reparation from the guilty, but such a sacrificial expression of His own nature as must, if God and man be of one moral order, form the only conceivable medium of forgiveness. Thus, at Gethsemane and Calvary, faith discerns such a manifestation of Divine spiritual passion, such a tragic tension in which God spares Himself nothing, as makes our heart faint within us and stops every mouth before God. In this quite literal (and surely, in so far as we know what love can be, not unintelligible) sense, atonement is what it cost God to forgive the sin of the world. It is the supreme point at which we encounter the vast recurrent paradox of religious thought —that the God who stands infinitely above human life is yet deeply involved in our experience, and that to see into the unchanging heart of things we must gaze upon the travail of a cross. The forgiveness of God rises up through the depths of a passion that sinners can never fathom.

H. R. Mackintosh.

## *A SOMETIMES NEGLECTED FACTOR ILLUSTRATED.*

The student who is making an examination of the evidence on some particular difficulty sometimes is tempted to ask the question: Are scholars always quite just in their attitude towards the sagacity and caution of the writers of the Gospel records? The question is immediately suggested through happening to consult *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (Professor Bacon), p. 335, and the article on the "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (Professor Burkitt), in connexion with the topography of the Fourth Gospel. Professor Bacon asserts that the writer exhibits himself, by his topography, not as a companion and eye-witness, but as the "pilgrim antiquary of a century later." It will be observed that the evidence of personal knowledge of some at least of the places is admitted. The results of second-hand evidence will not meet the case, and the idea of a laborious student on a walking tour is introduced.

What are the principles of study to be employed here? Do they bear out such a statement? Only exact examination of particular instances on clear principles of study can guide us. In the first place, our knowledge may prove a writer to be inaccurate. If so, there is no more to be said. But, in the second place, silence, inability to verify, disproves nothing; and, thirdly, if the writer is proved accurate in the great majority of cases where the positive test can be applied (and at worst, in such instances, has not definitely been proved inaccurate), he must be assumed to be accurate on those points concerning which we have no positive information. I submit that no one has positively proved the author of the Fourth Gospel inaccurate on any

topographical point. The few instances adduced can, quite naturally, be explicated.

For example, the statement that, to reach Galilee from Jerusalem, Jesus must needs go through Samaria (John iv. 4), is one of the three or four illustrations invariably given of *John's* inaccuracy, and yet could any statement be more naturally written of Jesus? Only the mercilessly strict went round. The ordinary way, for a man not held by narrow restrictions, was the shortest way. It would have been, as *John* indicates, morally impossible for Jesus to have gone out of His way to buttress up bigotry. Neither chapter ii. 1,[1] with its time "the third day," nor iv. 46 ff.,[2] presents any overwhelming topographical difficulty. In the one case thirty miles a day, the pace Jesus would have to walk under the circumstances, is no remarkable tramp for an able-bodied man but a quite commonplace distance; in the other, where the times of the cure and of the nobleman's arrival seem separated by a greater length of time than the distance would warrant, sunset might be the division between yesterday and to-day, or the reckoning of time, as some hold, is here the same as ours. Other simple explanations suggest themselves. And it is so with any topographical example ever adduced as conflicting with known facts, in this Gospel. The candid mind finds itself free from real perplexity (cf. *The Gospels as Historical Documents* [Professor Stanton], Part III.). The truth is that scholarship too often loses its sense of perspective and does not ascribe ordinary intelligence in these matters to the Gospel writers. Even a "pilgrim antiquary" would avoid foolishness. Even such a one, cleverly finding out

[1] "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee. . . ."

[2] iv. 51, "And as he was going down his servants met him." 52, ". . . yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him." Capernaum and Cana are twenty miles apart.

so much, would have avoided meticulous details where he was not even sure of his broad facts. The only candid treatment assumes the writer to have been at least intelligent ; and on that basis of enquiry there is no topographical detail in this Gospel which cannot quite normally fall into its place with the facts so far as we do know them.

On the other hand, his accurate emphasis is very striking in the numerous instances which can be tested and proved.

If that is so, then the writer can claim serious consideration when he makes topographical statements that we are unable to verify, on which, that is, we have no information. Consider one such case. It is not selected for any other reason than that it always is given a most prominent place in the tiny list of negative examples of *John's* geographical incompetence. In i. 28 we have a reference to " Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing " (*Βηθανία*, not *Βηθαβαρᾶ*, is no doubt the reading). The learned scholar in the article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, referred to (vol. vi., p. 341), who dates the Gospel 100–110 A.D., pressed for room and choosing one instance, chooses this one as his example of the inaccuracy of *John's* topography. " It would be very easy to criticise the history and geography of the Fourth Gospel. As Matthew Arnold said, " Bethany beyond Jordan is like Willesden beyond Trent." But, if we ascribe intelligence to the New Testament writers, is it the same thing ? Matthew Arnold had (it is to be supposed) definite and final knowledge that there was not and never had been a Willesden beyond Trent. This is just the information that we do not possess with regard to Bethany. The situation more accurately is of this kind. I take up a book recounting incidents in the life of an Englishman of long ago and I read that a certain event happened at St. Ives " beyond Tamar." I do not immediately conclude, because, let us suppose, there is no

trace of this ancient St. Ivés existing over beyond the Tamar, that my author is unreliable. Since on other occasions in geography he is reliable where data still exist to test him, so far from his credibility being impugned here, he, rather, is to be treated and quoted as the authority for the fact of a St. Ives whose existence cannot now be otherwise verified. When I find in addition that he actually himself refers to another St. Ives as near Cambridge (of which I do know) and gives the precise distance, I am confirmed in my belief that my author's topographical knowledge is greater than mine, and that, by the ordinary laws applicable to the study of history and ancient writings, his positive statement is of much greater value in deciding the matter than my lack of information. So with *John's* emphatic distinction between the two Bethanys. The case is strengthened if Bethany is a name that might easily recur (cf. Sir G. A. Smith's *Hist. Geog.*, p. 496). An interesting instance for Scotland would be Kilbride in Ayrshire and Kilbride beyond the Sound of the Sleat. Of this particular Bethany there is no trace. Even Origen could find none, but it is an insignificant neighbourhood and war had ravaged it. There were many village sites in France unrecognisable as such and no one could say where precisely they lay, save by map reference. Artillery and the flight of the population were the causes. But a village razed to the ground is much the same as a village destroyed by artillery, especially if time has elapsed; and, if we allow for a dispersed population, a razed and at its best unimportant village, lack of records and lapse of time, failure on Origen's part and on later occasions need cause no surprise. On the other hand, "beyond Jordan" does not tell us whether it was a town or a district (although the absence of the article would seem to suggest the former). "St. Ives in Cornwall" would more naturally indicate a town than

"St. Ives beyond Tamar," and perhaps Bethany beyond Jordan was a district. There was, as a matter of fact, Betanea beyond the ford Abarah, so possibly this was the Bethany indicated. But whether that is so or not, fair dealing with the writer's topographical statements leaves us no option but to assume the correctness of his notes where we cannot check them, since they are always correct in this connexion where they can be checked, so long, that is, as we allow him ordinary care and common sense.

The Rev. R. H. Strachan has suggested in his penetrating book, *The Fourth Gospel*, that this Gospel is composite, and has elaborated his suggestion in *The Expository Times*, vol. xxvii., p. 22 ff., and the EXPOSITOR, viii., vol. vii., p. 255. Even so, Dr. Strachan emphasises the topographical accuracy of the source, and it must be assumed that when statements *appear* contradictory it is our ignorance which is at fault, unless and until we have proved the contrary. This with *John* i. 28 and xi. 18 no one has done —nor with any other topographical question in this Gospel.

In another direction this consideration of what men are likely to do must be applied to the study of this Gospel, as of all writings. When was it accepted as authoritative? The Rev. C. E. Raven, in *What think ye of Christ?* (p. 124), presses this question home unmercifully. "For it is after all a question of dates. There were men then living who were very watch-dogs of the traditions committed to them; men whose whole case against heresy was based upon the permanence and consistency of the Catholic witness. To one who knows their attitude of obstinate conservatism it is simply inconceivable that Irenæus, writing before 200 A.D., should have accepted four Gospels as no less securely established than the four quarters of heaven, the four winds of God, if one of these Gospels, and that the most divergent in style and contents, and the least in harmony with his

own outlook, had been written well within his own active life-time, 'some time between 130 and 150 A.D.,' and in a district with which he and his fellow-churchmen were intimately acquainted, 'the neighbourhood of Ephesus.' It simply will not do. Our credulity will not stand the strain." We cannot, in other words, ascribe either exceptional stupidity or wanton carelessness to these men. We must at least assume normal intelligence. Irenæus, who definitely specified the four Gospels, speaks with a reverence that every historian would concur in saying simply cannot be the growth of a day, nor of twenty years. It is the sure mark of a life attitude, of a fact rooted outside mere opinion. He represents more than a personal opinion. He stands for the common belief of the Church and that not of his own generation only. It is impossible to divide generations into water-tight compartments. Nor, to use Dr. Dods's similes, does a second generation arrive all at once, displacing and abolishing the first generation "like changing guard at a military post, or like the sudden displacement of day by night in the tropics." Striking examples can be gathered from other early writings (cf. *H.D.B.*, vol. ii., pp. 695 f.).

That is another illustration of the point I wish to submit. Just as, in that instance, we have to consider what shrewd men would be likely to accept, and why, so we must do with the Gospel writers what we do elsewhere: that is, allow an ordinary measure of plain sense to these thoughtful men. And this ascription of a modest grasp of the bearing of statements on the part of the writers and of those standing nearest to them in point of time should be a cardinal factor in every consideration of authorship or date.

INNES LOGAN.

## *HOW FAR IS THE FOURTH GOSPEL A UNITY?*

### I.

WHAT is the most likely line of approach to some measure of agreement concerning the greatest of all New Testament problems, the Fourth Gospel? While the chief conclusions regarding the origin and composition of the Synoptic Gospels have won a large amount of assent, one lays down each new book on the Fourth Gospel with a feeling akin to despair that little or nothing has been contributed which might make for agreement. The opposing camps are separated by entanglements which yearly become more impassable, and the one concern of each seems to be to consolidate its own position; of attempts at a *rapprochement* not a vestige! Now why should this be? Possibly it is due in part to the temperament of the average scholar (or should one say, of the eminent scholar?), to whom nothing is more distasteful than to withdraw from a position to which he has once committed himself in print. There are few temptations to a biassed judgment, few obstacles in the way of agreement on the big problems of scholarship more effective than the protagonists' determination at all cost to be consistent with their own several opinions once published.

But the lack of agreement is due far more to the nature of the problem itself. The Gospel is full of contrasts, even of seeming contradictions, and this union of opposites has led to the most diverse views as to its character and intention. Here we find inextricably interwoven history and

its interpretation, narrative often intensely pictorial and dramatic with a profound philosophy of religion, the most vivid realism with the purest and most mystical idealism. This, of course, has been recognised by critics of all schools. Lightfoot[1] speaks of " the accurate historical narrative of the facts, which forms the basis of the Gospel, and the theological teaching which is built as a superstructure upon this foundation." Sanday[2] defines the Gospel as " a blending of fact and of interpretation." Drummond[3] suggests that an Apostle may have " portrayed the Master of his heart's devotion in colours drawn from half a century of vivid experience of his indwelling spirit, and blended together the actual and ideal in lines which are no longer separable " ; while Schurer[4] in his survey of Weizsacher's view gives as the latter's opinion that " the historical and the ideal, tradition and theological reflection, were here blended into an indissoluble unity, so that every link of the account allowed of a double interpretation." Ernest Scott[5] sums up admirably when he says, " the author, writing in a period of transition, is continually striving to find place within the same system for opposite types of thought and belief " ; he has made his work a " union of opposites," and a " blending of various tendencies." Little wonder that it has been difficult to reach agreement on such a work. According as this or that type of thought, this or that tendency is emphasised and accepted as the key to the whole, so will be our interpretation of the Gospel. The problem is at least as many-sided as the solutions propounded for it.

The Gospel has been defined as " the supreme attempt to

[1] Lightfoot : *The Fourth Gospel, its authorship*, p. 151.
[2] Sanday : *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 169.
[3] Drummond : *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 397.
[4] Quoted by Stanton : *Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part III, p. 6.
[5] E. F. Scott : *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 10, 11.

reconcile the Jesus of history with the subsequent faith of the Church regarding Him." [1] It is, in fact, the first of a never-ending series of treatises on "the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience." And in a manner quite unexampled the author's heart's devotion is given to *both*. Here is another difficulty for the critic. As we read the narrative sections, every detail vividly drawn, each character alive with movement and individuality, we seem to see the historical Jesus living before our eyes. Surely, we feel, our author's supreme concern is to make that Jesus walk and teach once more; he is living the golden days over again, recalling them that his readers may share them with him. And then suddenly, almost before we are aware of any transition, not the historian but the mystic speaks. It is the voice of one who, if ever he knew Christ after the flesh, certainly does so no longer; nor does he desire his readers so to know Him; his interest is not history, but interpretation, not what Jesus said and did in the days of His flesh, but what His Spirit has wrought in the experience of His disciples; no longer the Jesus of history, but the Christ of experience is his Master. With a personality so elusive at the bar of judgment what wonder that the verdict of scholarship is still "non-proven," and likely to remain so? Which is the *real* author of the Gospel, the historian or the mystic, the story-teller or the philosopher, the realistic photographer or the idealising portrait painter? We feel at first that none but a personal disciple could so make the historic Jesus live again, only to be met by the rejoinder, that no eye-witness could possibly so lose interest in the historical Jesus as to idealise the intimate Friend with whom he had walked and talked into a being from another sphere, strictly not a man at all, but a God made manifest in the flesh, nay rather not so much a divine Person as a

[1] R. H. Strachan: *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 21.

universal divine principle, the Logos of God ; it would seem to follow that the apparent marks of an eye-witness can be nothing more than the device of a consummate literary artist.

Now, if scholarship is to arrive at any measure of agreement, is it not time to ask with renewed emphasis whether it is possible to attribute characteristics so contradictory to a single hand ? Can it be that one mind only is responsible for so complex a combination of opposites, for both the first-hand narrative of fact and the " spiritual gospel " built upon it ? If not, then the alternatives would seem to be two : either the Gospel, like the Synoptics, is the result of the working up of several distinct documents, i.e., we must subscribe to some form of partition theory ; or we must assume mediate authorship, i.e., that a later writer, relying for his facts upon the memories of an eye-witness, transmitted orally or more probably in writing (for only *written* memoirs could preserve detail so exact and picturesque), has given us the Gospel in its present form. Frankly one feels that only along such lines can we reach a middle position rendering possible a measure of agreement, which one fears will never be attained so long as the Gospel is regarded as the product of a single mind.

To one who feels thus, recent work upon the Gospel is distinctly disappointing. One looks in vain for any sign of compromise. Sixteen years ago Dr. Sanday remarked that whereas in the years immediately previous to 1900 opinion had seemed to gravitate more and more towards a middle position, since that date feeling had been hardening on one side or the other ; whereas in the former period " prominent scholars were working towards conciliation, at the present time . . . younger writers have come to the front, and they have not shown the same disposition for compromise. . . . The alternatives are once more not

so much between stricter and less strict history as between history and downright fiction."[1] Unfortunately that sentence is as true to-day as when it was written. Professor Stanton's latest book raised our hopes, but, all its learning and ability notwithstanding, there is an exasperating vagueness in its conclusions, and one lays down the volume with a distinct sense of disappointment.

The truth is that the gravitation of criticism to one extreme or another has left little room for the theory of mediate authorship, in which alone we can see hopes of ultimate compromise. Why are so few found willing to tread the middle way ? That the various partition theories have been largely discredited will be generally admitted—in the form in which they were originally put forward not unjustifiably discredited. Whether it be Wendt separating from the Gospel an original source composed of Logia of Jesus, or Wellhausen with his " foundation-document " resembling a Marcan outline, the process is much too like making a scrap-book with scissors and paste. Let us admit at once that every such attempt to analyse the Gospel in detail, giving this verse to one hand and that verse to another, is foredoomed to failure. The principles of analysis must be far too subjective to command assent, while the whole process is usually vitiated by the desire to rescue some preferred element, e.g. an original Johannine " Grundschrift " at the expense of the rest of the Gospel. The truth is that one man has left upon the whole Gospel the stamp of his own unmistakeable personality. " A poet of strong powers of thought and marked individuality, who has undertaken to raise an entirely new song, is here."[2] However indebted the book may be to previous thinkers, it impresses us, as few books do, by its unity, not to say its originality.

[1] Sanday : Op. cit., pp. 6, 7.
[2] Schwartz : quoted Stanton, Op. cit. p. 41.

Against all the analytical finessing of the partitionist the famous comparison of Strauss still has a large measure of truth ; the Gospel is like the seamless coat of our Lord. Even Wellhausen admits this : " in spite of its different strata it can be historically regarded as essentially a unity."[1] Every chapter is permeated with the author's individuality, an individuality so marked that it never permits him to hide himself, as Shakespeare does for example, behind the characters he creates. Thus the Gospel's complex elements are fused into a living whole by the vital personality of the author, so that with all its contrasts it impresses us with a sense of grand unity.

In face of all this, detailed analysis is ruled out ; but not so the general hypothesis that an earlier hand than the author's (may we even say an earlier written source ?) has played a most important part in the Gospel's composition. No doubt the author has so far assimilated the earlier material and stamped it with his own hall mark that the separation of the two strata is no longer possible. But it can still be urged that as he wrote he had the earlier tradition at his disposal as a source separate from his own recollections, probably actually as a written document. It appears to the writer that the special characteristics of the Gospel are best explained by the supposition that the author, not himself an eyewitness of the historical Jesus (or, as we shall see later, possibly an eye-witness only during His closing days), but rather one whose chief concern was to interpret to the thought of his own age what that Jesus stands for in men's experience, had before him as he wrote the written memoirs of an actual eye-witness, which he incorporated in his own work, leaving upon the whole the unmistakeable stamp of his own individuality, but at the same time retaining the vivid touches of the earlier narrative in order to add

[1] Wellhausen : *Das Evangelium Johannis*, p. 119.

life and vigour and colour to his own masterpiece. Only so can we explain the combination, often in a single section, of a power of narrative so vivid with so complete a lack of interest in history as such. The material of the Fourth Gospel did not spring into being in a day. It passed through a formative period before it finally became crystallised in the mind of that " poet of strong powers of thought," who gave it to the world, a single gem with many facets, each mingling its ray in one perfect harmony of beauty. During that period the memoirs of an eye-witness might well have played an important part as the nucleus around which there would gather the traditions and the doctrines which ultimately took form as our Gospel.

So much by way of introducing our hypothesis, no new one, but one which deserves more emphasis than it has lately received. In a subsequent article it will be our endeavour to prove by an examination of some typical passages the probability that there are at least three main strata in the Gospel :

(1) The memoirs of an eye-witness whose interest is chiefly historical and biographical, whose hero is " the Jesus of History," and to whom are due most of the life-like touches so prominent in the Gospel. This, if any, would be the original Johannine material ; we may call it J.

(2) The " Spiritual Gospel," that is the main body of the work, comprising the author's interpretation of the historical Jesus to the thought of his day and his estimate of Jesus' significance in men's experience. The interest is now focussed not on the Jesus of history but on the Christ of experience ; the motive is no longer biographical but apologetic : " These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." This, being the individual contribution of the author himself, we may call A.

(3) A certain amount of redactional material which must

be ascribed to a later editor (R), who has inserted comments, sometimes dislocated the original order of the narrative, occasionally even retouched portions of the Gospel to fit it for purposes which originally it was not meant to serve.

As we have seen, the author, A, has incorporated the J material in his own work, and so far assimilated it that detailed analysis is impossible. Accordingly, our aim will not be to separate J from A, but to prove that it existed previously *as a separate written source* traceable to an actual eye-witness. The R material can be more readily separated, for, being added later, it has not been assimilated to A, and does not bear A's unifying stamp.

Should such a hypothesis be capable of proof, the gain is clear. The historical value of the Gospel is greatly enhanced, for most of the *fact* will be directly traceable to an eye-witness. The advanced critical position robs the Gospel of all real value as history. If, on the other hand, we assume the author himself to be the eye-witness, we will still find it difficult to put much confidence in the historical facts narrated by a man who so obviously and constantly prefers allegory and spiritualisation to sober fact. It is just at this point that the argument of, e.g., Dr. James Drummond, who allows a large place to allegory and at the same time claims the author to be an eye-witness, fails to carry full conviction. As has been truly said : " Manifestly an apostolic eye-witness and intimate of Jesus who should so abuse his unique position as to offer speculative fiction and allegory instead of the rich store of personal recollections of the Master he was competent to give, would be worse than no witness at all."[1] If, on the contrary, J can be traced to a hand earlier than and independent of A, its value as trustworthy history will be unprejudiced by any charge of allegorising. Moreover, no longer trammelled by the

[1] Bacon : *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 13.

obsession that A must himself be an eye-witness, we will discover that his insight into the spiritual meaning of historical facts gives him a value, yes, even a historical value, entirely independent of the question whether he had or had not first-hand experience of those facts ; A's interpretation is the perfect complement of J's narrative, and in the two combined we have a document whose historical importance could not well be surpassed. " In history, as in religion, it is the spirit that quickens, and unless we can penetrate the spirit of great historical transactions, interpret the principles out of which they spring, and throw ourselves with sympathetic imagination into the passions which animated the great human drama, we miss the only truth that is worth receiving."[1] As even one of our most advanced critics admits, the idealised history of A is " genuine and true because reflecting the heart's faith of a great church in a great age."[2]

## II.

The aim of this article is to urge the probability that there underlies the main body of the gospel, which is the work of a later writer (A), the written memoirs of an actual eye-witness (J), possessing real value as trustworthy history.

Admittedly the motive of the Gospel as a whole is not historical ; if it is biography at all, then it is biography whose aim is not to convey information, but to impart spiritual truth ; a mere selection of incidents has been made, and the selection has been dictated by the desire not to impress facts upon the reader, but to bestow upon him life through faith : " These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; and that believing ye might have life through His name." When estimating the

[1] Drummond : Op. cit., p. 29.
[2] Bacon : Op. cit., p. 14.

historical value of the Gospel, we have been much too ready to criticise it for not conveying information which it never professed to convey. Even to-day there is much biography whose main end is not informative but didactic ; let me give an illustration culled at random from my book-shelves. In the introduction to a volume of biographical essays the author, after quoting John Howe's summing-up of his own purpose in a funeral sermon, " the little I shall say of my subject shall be, not by way of history, but of character," continues as follows : " This admirably expresses my own *motif* in these lectures. . . . In the present case it does not at all come within my province to tell the external story of any of my worthies. I assume that the life itself is in each case less or more familiar to my readers. . . . My main design is from selected characteristics of their Life and Life-work to incite and quicken to higher and nobler service of the Master in our day and generation. This being so, I am perfectly at ease . . . in anticipation of being charged with ' improving ' Howe and Baxter, Rutherford and Henry, as the old divines called their reading of lessons from special events and circumstances. To draw such lessons and to drive them home into heart and conscience *is* my purpose and endeavour . . . If any one choose to fling stones at me as ' didactic,' ' hortatory,' ' moralising,' and so on : so be it."[1] Can we not imagine the author of the Fourth Gospel retorting in exactly similar terms to some of his modern critics ? As is well known, Clement of Alexandria practically does this for him in his oft-quoted words, " Last of all, John, perceiving that the bodily (i.e. external) facts had been set forth in the other Gospels, at the instance of his disciples and with the inspiration of the Spirit composed a spiritual Gospel." What is meant by a " spiritual gospel " could not be better expressed than by the words

[1] A. B. Grosart : *Representative Nonconformists*, Introduction.

quoted above. Our author's theme was that aspect of Jesus' life in which the Holy Spirit was seen living and working, that life as interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the writer's own age. How the author came to write a "spiritual Gospel" is perfectly expressed in xv. 26, 27: "When the Comforter is come, . . . even the Spirit of truth, . . . he shall bear witness of me: and ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." A "spiritual gospel" is the Holy Spirit's interpretation of Jesus through the medium of a human witness, such as our author, who "from the beginning" has had a personal experience of the meaning of Jesus for his own life. But while this may be taken as a true definition we must remember that in the peculiar Philonic language current in Alexandria "that which is bodily" denoted the literal sense of Scripture, while "that which is spiritual" signified its figurative or allegorical meaning, so that Clement's words also express the obvious truth that our author has more interest in doctrine set forth in figurative language than he has in literal history.

With this in mind we may well ask whether we have the right to look for any real history at all in such a work. The parallel case of Philo suggests that the answer is in the affirmative. With all his fantastic allegorising even Philo does leave a place for actual history: "There have been some who, regarding the literal laws as symbols of ideal realities, were excessively scrupulous in some points, while in others they were lazily negligent. For my own part, I must blame such people for their laxity. For both elements demand attention, the most diligent search for hidden meanings, and the preservation of those on the surface which cannot be challenged."[1] How much more may we expect our author to handle his material as actual history,

[1] Philo: *De Migr. Abr.* 89. Quoted by Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, p. 36.

however much allegorical exegesis he may afterwards build upon it. For the most casual comparison of the Gospel with Philo convinces us that the evangelist attaches far more importance to the real historical background than ever Philo did. True his aim is to carry over Jesus from the realm of history to that of personal experience ; but he is always careful to insist that the Christ of experience is to be no abstraction, but the same living Master who once became flesh and tabernacled among us. Even the Spirit is a gift directly bestowed by the historical Jesus and the evangelist expresses this in symbolic language when he says (xx. 22) : " He *breathed on them*, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Throughout the motive may be didactic, but a real historical background is taken for granted. It is impossible for those who appreciate this fact to agree that in the Fourth Gospel " divine intention and operation are not interpreted by historical fact, but historical fact by divine intention and operation. What an incarnation of deity must say and do in order to make clear the redemptive plan, this is what is said and done."[1] Nor can we acquiesce in the finding to which even so cautious a scholar as Dr. Drummond commits himself : " If the writer himself intended his work to be interpreted in the spirit and not in the letter, he would have no hesitation in departing from the tradition, and, indeed, may have thought that the more he ran counter to it, the less likely was he to be misunderstood." " We are therefore thrown back on the hypothesis of a deliberate construction of narrative as a pictorial embodiment of spiritual truth."[2] The truth is surely just the reverse ; the very definition of a " spiritual gospel " demands that the author should *bring out* the spiritual truth of certain facts already known from other sources,

[1] Bacon : *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 12.
[2] Drummond : *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 47, 427.

not that he should *put in* facts that are not already there. The order of thought is always from established fact to doctrinal interpretation, not vice-versa. We may, I think, take it for granted that our author always starts from something, which he believes to be historically true. The words of Jesus and the events of His life were of the utmost importance to him as facts, quite apart from the train of speculative thought to which they might give rise.

We conclude, then, that it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that A would utilise real history as the background for his spiritual teaching ; and a study of the Gospel itself reveals many signs of historical verisimilitude. The narrative sections are all so perfectly natural that they appeal to one as at any rate intrinsically probable. This would be recognised more generally than it is, if the Fourth Gospel stood alone. But our habit of giving preference to the Synoptics on points of history makes us, perhaps, too ready to discount the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, when it conflicts with the Synoptic account. One cannot but feel that scholarship has succumbed much too readily to the temptation to allow the didactic aim of the discourses to give rise to an unfair suspicion of the narrative, as though everything in it peculiar to the Gospel must have been *invented* with a like intention. It is only when we examine the narrative portions separately, and with an unbiassed judgment, that we realise how often historical probability is on the side of the Fourth Gospel. This will be generally admitted with respect to the date assigned to the Last Supper and the death of Jesus. But in quite a number of other narrative sections also, there is much which suggests the possession of sound information. We can merely mention in passing the description of the choosing of the disciples, the picture given of the Baptist, the remarkable chronological accuracy of the statement in ii. 20,

concerning the building of the temple, the insistence that Jesus paid several visits to Jerusalem before the last Passover (in this connexion, it is interesting to note that once the obvious dislocation of the text in chapters v.–vii. is corrected, apart from the Passover of ii. 13, the Fourth Gospel assigns no extra visit to Jerusalem to the period covered by the Synoptics till we come to Pentecost A.D. 28, during the last year of the ministry (v. and vii. 15–24; our Gospel is thus much less out of harmony with Mark than is generally supposed [1]); in the account of the arrest and trial, too, some of the details whereby the Synoptics are supplemented or even tacitly corrected carry the marks of probability.

Our conviction that the Gospel contains a groundwork of real history is naturally greatly strengthened by the presence throughout of so much vivid detail and so many "marks of an eye-witness." That the Gospel abounds in this graphic colouring is so generally recognised that it is needless to dwell on the fact. We need only instance the frequency with which names occur, even when the name is of no great consequence (it may be true that this is quite in accordance with the usage of apocryphal writers also, but in their case it is personal names, rather than place-names, that are multiplied; the Fourth Gospel abounds in both), and such typical scenes as the call of the disciples, Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman, the feeding of the multitude, the healing of the man born blind, the raising of Lazarus, the Resurrection. It is, of course, often urged that all this detail is symbolic; but if so, it is strange that the evangelist never gives any indication of the hidden lesson which he intends his readers to gather. Surely he would have pointed his allegory more often than he does. Philo, as a matter of fact, does this; he leaves nothing

[1] See Warburton Lewis, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 12.

whatever to the reader's imagination.[1] It was surely necessary for our author to be at least as explicit, if he really intended to impart truth, and above all *new* truth, under cryptic "symbols" which would much more naturally be accepted in their obvious sense as narrating actual facts.

Again, how life-like are the characters which meet us in these pages. Each one is a clearly-drawn portrait. We know the names of the various disciples from the Synoptics, but it is the Fourth Gospel which enables us to visualise them as living men. Each actor in the story is individualised in the most lively manner, and this is true not only of the prominent characters, but even of those who are introduced merely by the way to serve a didactic purpose, such as Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria, and, above all, the man born blind, whose portrait is perhaps more wonderfully true to life than anything else in the Gospel. And what are we to say of Jesus' own portrait ? Nowhere is there so marked a contrast between the narrative and the doctrinal sections as here. The Prologue may reveal to us a Christ who is the eternal Word of God, but as we read the story, there passes before our eyes no idealised Divine Principle, but a real man, who is tired after a journey and sits down to rest at a well side "just as He was," just as any one of us might do, who is troubled in spirit and even weeps. Surely all this reads like very real history, just such a narrative as an actual eye-witness might give us.

Now, it is of course possible to allow all this, and yet to urge that it is the author of the whole Gospel, A himself, who is the eye-witness responsible for the historical background. Is there really anything to suggest that the historical material existed as a separate source (J) apart from and earlier than A ? Now, most of us will agree that

[1] See Kennedy, Op. cit., pp. 48, 49.

there are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of supposing that the author of the doctrinal sections, whose attitude to the historical Jesus is so impersonal and whose thought reflects so largely the problems of a later age, can himself be the eye-witness. Once this is recognised, quite apart from the difficulty of crediting A with a literary genius *modern* enough thus to clothe his inventions in the garb of truth, there are several *a priori* reasons for considering it probable that A had before him an earlier written source.

To begin with, this supposition best explains the Gospel's peculiar relation to the Synoptics. With the latter in some form, if not actually with our three Gospels, our author is obviously acquainted, and even takes for granted a knowledge of them on the part of the reader. Yet he does not hesitate frequently to set the Synoptics aside. Would he have ventured to do this, writing as he was to readers already familiar with the Synoptic tradition, had he not the authority of an independent, but equally reliable, historical source ? Quite a few of the incidents narrated in the Gospel so far resemble the Synoptic account as to make it probable that both are dealing with the same occasion, and yet in important details our author deliberately goes his own way (e.g. xii. 1 ff., and compare the healing of the nobleman's son in John iv. 46 ff. with the healing of the centurion's servant in Matthew viii. 5 ff.). It is often argued that in such cases our author has merely borrowed the incidents, and altered the details to suit his own didactic purpose ; but the alterations, as in the example given above, often serve no such purpose, and it is surely much more natural to suppose that A is following an independent tradition.

There are one or two definite hints that A had a written source before him. One example must suffice : in v. 2 we read, " there is at Jerusalem, by the sheep market, a

pool . . ." Note the present tense and remember that by the time A published his Gospel Jerusalem was in ruins. May it be that A is here quoting from an earlier written memoir (J), which he here incorporates in his work ? The Gospel throughout frequently reflects the point of view of a time much earlier than the date of its publication. It has, for example, been pointed out that its account of the Passover season is quite in line with a state of things which definitely came to an end with the destruction of the Temple, so that A writing at the beginning of the second century must have had access to a trustworthy source.

Turning now to the Gospel with the probability established that A may have owed his history to an earlier hand, we at once find corroboration in the peculiar relation borne by the narrative to the doctrinal sections. Quite apart from the improbability that one whose interest is mainly doctrinal would take the trouble to work up so elaborate a historical background, abounding as it does in any amount of pictorial but quite unessential detail, we make the following very significant discovery. For a few verses the detail is minute and extraordinarily vivid ; and yet the author manifests a strange, sometimes almost an exasperating lack of sustained interest in history as such. He stages his characters, rivets our attention upon them, but just as we are looking for the dénouement, all interest vanishes and the narrative drifts over into a doctrinal meditation. Even Dr. Sanday, with all his emphasis on the unity of the Gospel, seems to realise this fact, though he quite fails to see its significance, when he admits that all the signs of an eye-witness " belong to the framework, or setting of the narrative, and not to its salient features." [1] The truth is that it is in the unimportant detail, not in its larger outlook, that the Gospel manifests its interest in

[1] Sanday, Op. cit., 142.

history, which would seem to suggest that we must look for the historian in the compiler of the incorporated memoirs, not in the author of the Gospel as a whole. We become interested in some narrative, only to find it " run into the sand." Some character is introduced, only to " evaporate from the stage " a few verses later. We might look for such a method in a homily illustrated by anecdote (e.g., Paul provides us with an example in his abrupt transition from narrative to doctrine at Galatians ii. 15), but it is strange from one with so lively an interest in history as the author of the narrative sections of the Gospel. Illustrations may be drawn from almost any page. We have a life-like account of Nicodemus coming to interview Jesus, but A is not sufficiently interested even to tell us the result of the conversation, but passes over into a quite general disquisition on the second birth. The " Greeks " come to see Jesus; could anything be more interesting historically than this first emergence of the Foreign Missions problem ? Yet A does not even tell us whether Jesus consented to see them. Their mention merely leads up to a long discourse on the meaning of Christ's death. But there is no need to multiply examples every one of which suggests that a historical basis does underlie the Gospel, but that A's interest is in ideas and not at all in persons and facts, so that the historical detail must be traced in all probability to an earlier hand.

It is noticeable, too, that in the closest connexion with the most realistic narrative doctrinal inferences are drawn and claims put into the mouth of Jesus which historically are most difficult to accept. A good example is Jesus' interview with the Samaritan woman. Nowhere in the Gospel are the topographical allusions more accurate : the great highroad passing through Samaria through which " he must needs go " on His way from Judæa to Galilee,

the deep well, the reference to the overhanging heights of Gerizim, the illustrations drawn from the ripening cornfields, for which the locality is noted—we can trace the hand of an eye-witness in every line. And yet Jesus is represented thus early in His career as declaring Himself to be the Messiah, which claim is acknowledged by large numbers of the Samaritans, who declare their conviction " that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Is it really probable, we ask, that so vivid and accurate a narrative is the original work of the same hand which built upon it doctrinal implications so improbable from the historical point of view ? How much more likely to suppose that A has borrowed his background from the memoirs of the eye-witness J, and having thus set the stage allows the woman to leave her water-pot behind and disappear, while A himself using her merely as a " point d'appui " unfolds his great theme of the messiahship of Christ.

If such a source as we conceive J to have been really existed, it may be asked why no clearer traces have been left of it. Eusebius, in a well-known passage (iii. 24), writes as follows : " Nevertheless, of all the disciples of the Lord, only Matthew and John have left us written memoirs . . . Matthew, having previously preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other peoples, committed to writing the Gospel that bears his name in his native tongue, . . . John, having before spent all his time in oral preaching, at last came also to write." Now, scholarship is practically agreed that if we owe anything to Matthew's own hand, it is not " the Gospel that bears his name," but the hypothetical collection of Logia which we know as " Q." May not the truth be similar in the case of the Fourth Gospel, into which may have been inserted, after revision, an earlier historical source, possibly from the hand of the Apostle John himself, just as has happened in the case of the

Gospels of Matthew and Luke ? If it be objected that such a Johannine source would never have been allowed completely to disappear, we only have to appeal to the exactly similar fate of Matthew's Logia. In all ancient literature it is notorious that once a lesser work has been incorporated into and superseded by a greater one, which has itself become authoritative, the earlier work very soon ceases to circulate separately. There would seem, therefore, to be no good reason to prevent us supposing that there underlies our Fourth Gospel some such original source, though we frankly admit that it must always be impossible clearly to define the lines of cleavage in a document on which our " poet of strong powers of thought and marked individuality " has set his stamp.

## III.

In our attempt to prove that there underlies the main body (A) of the Fourth Gospel the memoirs of an eye-witness (J), to whom we owe most of the historic background, we have so far barely touched upon the discourses, and these now demand separate treatment. Are there any traces here of J's work, or in other words, have we any right to look to the Gospel as a source for actual sayings of Jesus ? Throughout the Gospel discourses and other matter are closely interlaced, and if, as we have seen, a large part of the narrative seems to come from a trustworthy source, there would appear *a priori* to be no good reason for doubting that the same may be true in part of the discourses. One feels that the Gospel has been too much ignored as a treasury of the real words of Jesus. This has been mainly due to two reasons : firstly, to the apparent difference in form between Jesus' sayings as reported in the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. We have the impression that whereas in the Synoptics Jesus' sayings are short and pithy and axio-

matic, in the Fourth Gospel they are discursive and dialectical. While the distinction is broadly true, we are too apt to forget that our Gospel abounds in just such concise and pithy sayings as characterise Jesus' speech as reported in the Synoptics. No doubt to the casual reader they are almost lost in A's elaboration of them, but a more careful study reveals them dotted here and there like gems in a cunningly wrought setting. "Unless a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "I am the bread of life." "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "I am the light of the world." "I am the resurrection and the life." "He that loves his life shall lose it; and he that hates his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."[1] The last example is particularly interesting, as containing the same characteristic use of the word "hate" as occurs in Luke xiv. 26.

In the second place, no less difficulty has been felt in the content of the speeches; they are now mystical and speculative, while in the Synoptics they are essentially ethical and practical. But there must almost certainly have been a speculative side to Jesus' teaching, else He could hardly have influenced the world's *thought* as in fact He has done, so that here our Gospel's supplementation of the Synoptics would seem to be historically true. Nor must we overlook the presence of passages of a distinctly "Johannine" flavour even in the Synoptics. The most remarkable example is of course Matthew xi. 25 ff., Luke x. 21 f.; but there are many other places also where the estimate of Jesus' Person and Mission approximates closely to that of our Gospel, e.g. in the account of the Temptation, Jesus' commission to His disciples, the Parable of the Vineyard and of the Last Judgment. If such thoughts have found a

[1] An exhaustive selection is given by Drummond: *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 18 f.

place in the Synoptics at all, they surely cannot have been merely passing thoughts, but must reflect a real element in Jesus' teaching. It is, moreover, most significant how the thought of the Synoptics approximates to that of our Gospel when they are dealing either with Jesus' talk to the inner circle of His disciples or with incidents the facts about which must have been learned at first hand from Jesus Himself, e.g. the account of the Temptation. As the Fourth Gospel is essentially an interpretation of Jesus' inner life, and introduces us far more frequently than do the Synoptics into the heart to heart talks of Jesus with His friends, it is not surprising that the type of teaching, which in the Synoptics is occasional, has here become the rule.

There seems, therefore, no reason to doubt that A may have derived some of the sayings which he imputes to Jesus from an earlier written source, which is historically trustworthy. No one, of course, would look for verbal exactness, save perhaps in the case of some of the pithy maxims. But the very originality of the sayings and their contrast with those reported in the Synoptics would seem to suggest that they were handed down to A in a *written* document. A cannot have set them down as we have them in our Gospel till at least sixty years after they were spoken ; had they been meantime preserved merely as oral reminiscences or through being made the subject of catechetical instruction, they would almost certainly have blended more closely with the ruling Synoptic tradition, and could not have stood out with their present originality. We may therefore conclude that J contained not only simple narrative, but also a sufficient amount of discourse material to form the nucleus of the speeches which A has worked up into an artistic whole. This is indeed suggested by the fact that here and there the vivid touches so characteristic of the narrative are carried over into the discourse founded upon

it. For example, in His discourse to the disciples at the Well of Sychar Jesus says: "There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest. Behold I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest." Lightfoot here calls attention to the local allusion, "which, without the experience of modern travellers, would escape notice: . . . when we once realise the scene, when in imagination our eye ranges over that vast expanse of growing corn—so unusual in Palestine, however familiar in corn-growing England—we are at once struck with the truthfulness and the significance of this allusive parable."[1] Surely the hand which is responsible for the whole picturesque story may be traced in the discourse material also.

This is not to say that the whole, or even any large part, of the discourses as we have them, can be traced back to a historical source. A has, without doubt, greatly elaborated the original material, and has largely transformed its substance by allowing his own feelings and experiences to intermingle with it, while he has often linked on his own reflections so closely to Jesus' words, that it is impossible to decide where the discourse ends and its interpretation begins. But we may, I think, conclude that many at least of the short pithy sayings may be traced back through J to Jesus Himself. We may, in fact, even go so far as to suppose that J himself may have been partly responsible for the elaboration of these sayings. If, for the moment, we may take J to be the Apostle John himself, and also accept as something like the truth Eusebius' tradition (iii. 24) that "John, having before spent all his time in oral preaching, at last came also to write," we can easily see how this may have happened. In the course of his preaching John may be supposed to have paraphrased Jesus' actual words in order

[1] Lightfoot in *The Fourth Gospel, its Authorship*, p. 164.

to bring out their meaning. The preacher's high claims for his Master may even have become interwoven with Jesus' own words, so that ultimately they were ascribed to Jesus Himself. Thus, when John committed his reminiscences to writing in our hypothetical J source, the characteristics which distinguish our present Gospel were already well marked, and the way made easy for A's still greater elaboration.

At any rate, it is safe to affirm that the great themes of the Gospel were suggested to A by J's reminiscences of the actual preaching of Jesus. It has, for example, often been pointed out that the doctrine of the Logos put forward in the Prologue is carried over into the main body of the Gospel under the ideas of spiritual Life and Light. But it is not the Logos which is the starting-point out of which is developed the thought of Christ the world's Life and Light. It is far truer to say that the latter ideas came to A through J straight from Jesus Himself, and that A set them in the forefront of his Gospel under the guise of the Logos doctrine, conceiving this to be the best category under which he might introduce to the thought of his day the supreme theme of God incarnate in Jesus. The philosophical elaboration is A's own, but the great theme he owes to J's memories of Jesus' words. Once again, Philo provides us with a parallel. He will take, for example, the authentic words of Moses as given in Numbers xiii. 17–20, and construct upon them an elaborate discourse of his own, retaining, however, the chief ideas of the original.[1] Just so may we suppose that A found his basis in some actual saying of Jesus preserved in J and upon it built up one of his characteristic discourses. But once again we must resist the temptation to analyse too closely; enough to know that the background of history may be actually present.

[1] See Kennedy: *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, p. 50.

" The writer himself probably could not have told us in the case of the longer speeches that this was said in the flesh, and that in the spirit, nor did he care to make such an analysis. . . . We, too, may well withhold our hands from the seamless robe." [1]

The probability that an earlier source underlies the Gospel is perhaps suggested once more by the presence here and there of " parenthetic comments," some of them purely explanatory, others showing an apparent discrepancy between the point of view of the writer and the material with which he is dealing. It is the latter which are the most interesting. Now a comment of any sort is essentially a reflection made by the writer *in propria persona* upon some statement which has been brought to his notice. That is it at least suggests the possibility that a later hand is commenting upon the remarks of an earlier hand. Possibility is changed to probability, almost to certainty, when it is found that the commentator has misunderstood the real point of the phrase on which he is commenting. One man cannot possibly be responsible both for a statement and for his own misinterpretation of it. As Wellhausen well says, " A writer may be negligent and maladroit, and once in a way even a little forgetful, but he must know what he means and cannot lose forthwith all idea of what he has himself said." [2] Thus, when, e.g., a saying of Jesus is followed by a comment made quite obviously from a different point of view, we may conclude that the hand to which we owe the saying is earlier than that which makes the comment.

Now, it is usual to explain most of these comments as insertions of a later editor (R), that is, we have here R commenting upon what may be the original work of A.

[1] Drummond, Op. cit., p. 41.

[2] Wellhaussn : *Ev. John*, p. 4. Quoted by Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part III., p. 37.

No doubt this explanation is sometimes correct; some comments, if indeed they are anything more than marginal glosses which have become inserted in the text, are undoubtedly due to R (e.g. ii. 11, iii. 24, iv. 2, iv. 54 and possibly xviii. 13–14). But not a few of these comments, though possibly they misunderstand the original significance of the immediately preceding words, yet display much too close a parallelism with the thought of the Gospel as a whole to permit of them being attributed to R, and one feels that they would be much better explained as comments by A on J, rather than by R on A. After all, "the Redactor" is the last resource of the despairing critic and it ought to be a first principle of criticism to introduce him only where absolutely necessary. We know nothing whatever about R, and we ought not, as Lightfoot has somewhere put it, "to draw unlimited cheques on the bank of the unknown." We might expect a comment by R on A not merely to misinterpret A's meaning, but also to be made from a spiritually lower level; at any rate, it is the custom of those who would appeal to R on every possible occasion to credit him with the minimum of spiritual insight! If, however, A is commenting on J, then he may perhaps misinterpret the original significance of J's words, but the misinterpretation would probably be due to A's characteristic desire to draw from a plain statement of fact a spiritual or allegorical meaning.

Now there are two parenthetic comments, both of them usually attributed to R, which admirably illustrate this contrast, which we have suggested might be expected between a comment by R and one by A. In xviii. 8 Jesus says, "I have told you that I am he; if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way." There then follows the comment: "That the saying might be fulfilled, which he spake, Of them that thou gavest me have I lost none."

This refers back to xvii. 12 (" While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name : those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost "), and misinterprets Jesus' assurance of spiritual protection, as if it were fulfilled in the request that His disciples should not be arrested. This shows an obvious lack of spiritual discernment and the comment may well be attributed to R. But contrast the following passage : in ii. 19 Jesus says, " Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." In v. 21 there follows the comment, " But he spake of the temple of his body." Now what have we here ? Possibly a misinterpretation of the strictly literal meaning of Jesus' words ; but there is no lowering of the spiritual level ; on the contrary we have a perfect illustration of A's characteristic outlook, an attempt to put a spiritual and allegorical interpretation on a plain statement of fact. We have therefore no hesitation in affirming that here we have a comment not by R on A, but by A on J. The contrast with xviii. 9 could not be plainer ; there we found that a spiritual truth had been degraded that it might be made to apply to material circumstances. Here a plain statement has been exalted into allegory and made the medium of a spiritual prophecy. Similarly, rather than introduce R unnecessarily, vi. 46, vii. 39, viii. 27, xii. 33, xviii. 32 may perhaps be put down as comments by A upon the J material which he is in process of incorporating. It is not always easy to see why a hypothetical editor should have taken up his pen to interject a comment at the particular point under discussion, while A, with his pen already in his hand, might easily have done so. If this argument holds, we have strong additional proof of the existence of our original J source.

The same deduction may perhaps be drawn from the presence in the Gospel of what Ernest Scott calls " isolated

ideas which cannot be reconciled with the characteristic Johannine thought," and which " can only be regarded as fragments of the earlier doctrine that have simply been taken over without any, or with a very imperfect, attempt at assimilation."[1] It sometimes seems as if A has taken over from J some thought or some version of a particular train of events without considering whether it harmonises altogether with his scheme as a whole. One example must suffice : A's thought hardly leaves room for the traditional Synoptic teaching that Jesus' Resurrection was followed by an interval of reunion and that it was only after this that the Ascension took place, the Second Coming being reserved to some indefinite period in the future. In our Gospel the Cross, Resurrection, Ascension, Second Coming are but moments in one great event, almost merged or telescoped one into the other. Yet in xx. 17 Jesus says, " Touch me not ; for I am not yet ascended to my Father : but go unto my brethren and say unto them : I ascend unto my Father and your Father ; and to my God and your God." A may well have taken these words over from J and incorporated them in his Gospel without considering that his own scheme of thought really left no room for a physical ascension such as the words imply, and such as is described by the writer of Acts.

Finally, the hypothesis of an earlier historical source underlying the Gospel is perhaps the simplest explanation of the presence in it of passages which are apparently " conglomerates." A good example is iv. 35–38, through which it is impossible to trace a single sequence of thought. Verse 35, with its local allusion, admirably suits both place and occasion ; but, apart from the similarity of subject (i.e., sowing and reaping), the other verses seem to have no logical connexion with it. We may also instance

[1] E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 9.

chapter x. In *vv.* 1–6 and again at *vv.* 11 ff., Jesus Himself is the Shepherd; but these two kindred passages are disjoined by the introduction in *vv.* 7–10 of quite a different allegory, though one dealing with the same subject. A reasonable explanation of this would be that A had before him a written source, from which he made a collection of passages dealing with kindred subjects, afterwards placing them together in a single paragraph as we now have them.

It has always been objected against the view that the Gospel contains a deposit of trustworthy history, that in contrast to the Synoptics it is entirely lacking in historical development. Now it would be no little support to our theory if it could be proved that the J material at least does show signs of that development. A remark by Sanday suggests, though certainly without any intention on his part, that we may be on the right lines. "We have seen, he says, "that the Fourth Gospel is by no means wanting in traces of this evolution. But these are traces, preserved incidentally and almost accidentally, without any deliberate purpose on the part of the author: they are the product of his historical sense, as distinct from the special object and the large idea that he had before his mind in writing his Gospel."[1] Let us say: they are the product of his historical source, as distinct from his own special didactic elaboration of it. A himself, writing long years after, would no doubt have his perspective foreshortened, and would lose all sense of development, and in so far as he has stamped his own point of view upon the Gospel, it, too, is entirely lacking in development. But let us separate if we can what may be J material from the doctrinal superstructure which A has built upon it, and we may have cause to revise our verdict. It is only natural that A should have stamped his own hall mark particularly clearly upon the

[1] Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 209.

opening chapters; he would desire, at the earliest possible moment to impress upon the reader his own vehement convictions, and this may well be the reason why, in contradiction to the Synoptic account, the loftiest claims are put forward on Jesus' behalf at the very beginning of His ministry, and are even acknowledged by his fellow-countrymen. But look at the attitude taken up towards Jesus by the people from chapter vii. onwards, as portrayed for us in the vivid narrative pictures. The disciples throughout may be taken to reflect A's own point of view, and accordingly they acknowledge Jesus as the Christ from the beginning. But there is a real development noticeable in the attitude of outsiders. In chapter vii. His own brethren so far doubt Him as to insinuate that He does not dare go to Jerusalem to put His claims to the test. When He does arrive in Jerusalem the speculations of the people about Him are of the vaguest character. The farthest they will go is to ask doubtfully, "Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ?" At a later date still (x. 24) the Jews come round about Jesus and ask Him, "How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." When it is sweepingly asserted that our Gospel represents Jesus as revealing His Messiahship at the very outset of His ministry, we must demand that sayings like these should be taken into account. Let us rather admit that, although A, looking back from the vantage-point of half a century of discipleship, reads into the early history truths about Jesus which his own spiritual experience had made far too precious to be subordinated to any theory of history, yet the historical background does show signs of exactly the same evolutionary process as the Synoptics; all of which goes far to prove that we are right in our surmise that there underlies A's "Spiritual Gospel" the memoirs of an actual eye-witness, possibly of the Apostle John himself.

G. H. C. Macgregor.

## *THE MESSAGE OF THE BOOK OF JOB.*

By common consent *Job* ranks among the masterpieces of the world's literature. On literary grounds alone, unlike many works sometime held in high esteem, it can never lapse into obscurity and find its final resting place upon the dusty shelves of the ever-growing library of forgotten books—by far the largest library upon earth. *Job* is, however, something more than a literary treasure; it is a contribution to the religious thought of mankind, at once splendid and profound. From a long succession of distinguished scholars it has received attention commensurate with its intrinsic worth, and has afforded ample subject-matter for a literature of its own, a literature so extensive and, it may be added, so controversial that the thorough mastery thereof can only be acquired by many years of industry and research.

On almost every point connected with the criticism of *Job* much difference of opinion exists, and upon such matters as its purpose and integrity, its historicity and date very divergent views have been advanced; while even the literary form in which it is presented has been defined in widely different terms. Anything in the nature of a critical discussion of the various matters indicated above is beyond the scope of the present paper, which is principally concerned with the first-named, and even with reference to that not a little must perforce remain unsaid; while as for the rest, if referred to at all, the merest passing glance is all that can be given.

The purpose of this paper is to point out what appears to the writer to be the outstanding message of this wonderful composition. The careful student of *Job* will of course gain helpful glimpses of other truths, important enough

in themselves; these, however, being regarded as incidental in character, must so far as the present inquiry is concerned be suffered to pass. We shall focus our whole attention upon one great truth the enunciation of which appears to the writer to be the vital contribution of *Job* to religious thought. Other matters will be referred to only in so far as they are relevant to this.

Stated in the most general terms, the theme of *Job* is the mystery of pain, which, undeserved or purposeless or both, as it not infrequently appears to be, presents a problem which is as old as humanity itself, a problem to which solutions without number have been offered, many of them unsatisfying enough. That in *Job* we have a notable attempt to contribute to the solution of this problem is a fact which few will be disposed to deny. It is when one comes to details, to the determination of the particular point which its author had it in mind to enforce, that differences of opinion begin to manifest themselves.

It may perhaps be considered that, before proceeding further with this inquiry, something ought to be said with reference to the integrity or otherwise of *Job*. Are we to take the book as it stands, accepting it as a single complete work? or should we regard it as a mosaic, as including the work of various hands, composed not improbably at different, perhaps widely different, dates, and representing several distinct strata of development of man's knowledge of God? For the latter view, it must be admitted, a case may be made out, though some of the evidence adduced in its support is decidedly open to criticism, if not indeed flimsy and inconclusive. Beyond saying that a strong case can be made out for the originality of *Job* in the form in which it has come to us, it does not fall within the limits of this paper to discuss the question, adequate treatment of which, from various points of view, is readily accessible

to those desiring to pursue it further. For our purpose, without committing ourselves at the outset to any special theory of its origin and composition, it must suffice to confine our inquiry to the determination of the moral and religious import of *Job* in its familiar form. The question of date also may remain undiscussed, though, as a matter of opinion, it can be said in passing that there are indications which seem to suggest *Job* may have been contemporary with the earlier period of the Babylonian exile. At all events in that troubled time there must have been many in Israel involved in grave sufferings which, so far as they personally were concerned, were as undeserved as those of Job himself.

Some expositors of *Job* find the clue to its message in the famous passage beginning: "I know that my Redeemer liveth" (xix. 25–27), finding therein an intimation to perplexed and suffering humanity that the riddle of life on earth will be solved, and its inequalities redressed in a life beyond the grave. Attractive, in many ways, as this suggestion is, it is encumbered with serious difficulties, and there is some reason for looking elsewhere for a clue to the solution of the problem of the book. The view adopted in this paper is that such clue may be found in i. 9.

It is not infrequently argued that the historical prologue of *Job* has an origin independent of that of the poetical portions of the book; and more than one reason has been adduced in support of this contention. To the present writer, however, the originality of the prologue appears to be essential to the coherence and significance of the outstanding message of the work as a whole, being in some sort the key to all that follows, a fact which none of the objections raised appear adequate to outweigh. Some of these objections, in matter of fact, are worth very little. That the prologue should be in prose and the colloquies in verse

does not preclude their both being from the same hand; in view of their relation each to other, the contrast in literary form appears to be a not ineffective literary device. That the sacred name "Yahweh" should be used in the prologue, while in the speeches which follow He is referred to under a more general title, is true to the facts of the case as presented. In the prologue the author writes as a Hebrew and refers to the deity under a title commonly used by his own people, in his own day; in the colloquies he puts words into the mouths of speakers presumed to have lived in a remote past, and beyond the limits of the Hebrew world, and quite consistently he represents them as referring to the deity in terms which such people might have used.

The story of the prologue may or may not be literal history, but in a literary sense it supplies a historical starting-point for the colloquies. It tells the reader, it should be observed, something which the speakers are not supposed to know. As compared with the latter, therefore, the former is in a position to listen to their conversation as one better informed as to the whole circumstances of the case than they are, and in consequence to appraise to better advantage the real significance of their discourse. This is a point of first-rate importance which must never be left out of sight by one who would really get at the heart of the book.

To the reader of *Job* is vouchsafed a peep within the veil, a glimpse of the unseen, which neither Job himself nor his friends were permitted to enjoy. That peep into the Presence Chamber of the King of kings, and the remarkable conversation which is overheard, affords a clue to the interpretation of all that follows. Some expositors, the late Canon Cheyne, for example, are content to say that "heaven is thrown open to us that we may see what Yahwè Himself

thinks of Job." But this is, indeed, a shallow and unsatisfying explanation of that strange assembly, before the throne of the Eternal, of the "sons of God" revealed to the beholder. The precise meaning of the expression "sons of God," whether intended to describe children of earth or the angel host of heaven, we need not now discuss. Among the sons of God comes Satan, more properly *the Satan*, for the word has the article and does not seem to be used in this context as a proper name : it appears rather to have a general sense, *the Adversary*, or we might almost say *the Critic*, whether friendly or unfriendly is not definitely stated, though the whole tone of the narrative and conversation strongly suggests the latter. The exact determination of the character and personality of the Critic does not, however, really affect the main point with which we are at present more particularly concerned.

*Hast thou considered my servant Job?* says Yahweh to the Critic, who promptly replies with another question, *Doth Job fear God for nought?* The implied challenge of this reply is accepted forthwith, and the sorrows and vicissitudes of Job are the result. The controversy between Yahweh and the Critic, arising in the Presence Chamber of heaven, is to be determined on the lower plane of earth. Job suffered not purposelessly, but with a definite end in view, he suffered as champion meeting by suffering a challenge of whose giving he was unaware, determining an issue which he did not know to have arisen. The final cause of his sorrow and pain is known to us, but it had not been revealed to him. In his ignorance of all that was really involved in it, the dark experience through which he was called to pass appeared to Job to be undeserved and purposeless, hence the mental and moral strain of the conflict which he was called upon to endure. For he of course could not know that his suffering, so far from being

purposeless, was intended to work out its purpose on a higher than the earthly plane.

What then was, in fact, the end that Job suffered to accomplish? Unquestionably he suffered as a vindicator, but a vindicator of what? The answer which lies nearest to the surface of things, and which is perhaps most frequently returned, is to the effect that Job suffered to vindicate his own character in the eyes of beholders whom he could not see. Incidentally indeed Job did vindicate himself, and did afford witness that his loyalty to God was not merely interested and selfish. His own character was no doubt involved in the Critic's challenge, but the view here suggested is that it was not the real object of attack, and that any reflection upon it was merely incidental to an attack at once more subtle and more daring. It was the Eternal Himself who was the real object of the Critic's challenge.

*Doth Job fear God for nought?* is, in fact if not in form, a criticism directed less against Job than against Yahweh, and it is one which touches on a very tender spot. The question, of course, suggests a negative reply, and Yahweh is the principal object of the implied criticism, though this is a little disguised by the making of Job its apparent object. For the main point at issue seems to have been not so much whether even the best of men is entirely disinterested, but whether God Himself can inspire disinterested affection in the hearts of His human children. The implied suggestion is of course that He cannot, and that the fairest-seeming among them love Him not for Himself alone, but in the main for what they can get.

A moment's consideration will make sufficiently clear the serious character of this veiled attack. If it means anything, the question *Doth Job fear God for nought?* is a thinly disguised assertion that the Eternal is unable to win the disinterested love of even the most devout and

godly men. Such love as He can inspire is but the devotion of those who are interested in loving, whether on the score of favours enjoyed or favours to come. In default of these its essentially interested character inevitably will out. The mere suggestion of this is little less than an insult, and cannot but occasion humiliation and sorrow. Human experience confirms this. It would be difficult to find a man anywhere who would not be shamed and saddened by the thought that he is incapable of inspiring, in any quarter, disinterested love, that the only show of affection that he can look to find springs from hope of profit, and that no one loves him for himself alone. This seems to be the real aim of the shaft hurled by the Critic, Job is an incident merely; the shaft is directed against the Eternal Himself.

The challenge is accepted on the instant, and Job must suffer in order that it may be met. So far from suffering on the ground of his unworthiness, he suffers because of his worth. Job is a chosen vessel, chosen, though he himself is unaware of the fact, to vindicate the aspersed honour of God. As in the lists of an age gone by the mail-clad knight presented himself, with sword or lance, to champion his own honour, or that of another too great to appear in person, so Job is called to stand forth as the chosen champion of the Most High. He fights his battle, not with the ordinary weapons of earthly warfare but by endurance of sorrow and pain for which he can by no means account, as they have their starting-point in circumstances far beyond the range of human vision.

As one reads the familiar story with this thought in mind, it takes on a remarkably impressive character by reason of the contrast which it presents between the apparent and the real. Utterly unlike the medieval champion in glittering array is that sorely stricken one sitting among

the pots. Yet, sordid as is the picture which Job presents, so far as externals are concerned, he is in fact a truly splendid champion, the vindicator of the holiest cause who ever went forth to essay the ordeal of battle. Bereaved, poverty-stricken, and foul with disease, the fallen one, as he appears to be, is in reality exalted to high honour as the elected champion of the King of kings. History and romance together can produce no tourney to equal this, and many as are the striking and heroic figures in the long annals of chivalry, Job is in truth the noblest jouster of them all. Though he was all unaware of the real issues at stake, and understood not the real significance of the strange combat in which he was summoned to engage, right valiantly did he acquit himself therein, and achieved a victory the fame of which shall never sink into forgetfulness while the world lasts.

What then is the solution offered in *Job* to the problem of pain? There are doubtless suggestions of solution along more than one line, but these are at best secondary; and the outstanding contribution that the book makes to human thought upon this matter is surely that the pain and suffering incident to life on earth are conditioned not alone by factors belonging to the plane of earth, but also by those which have their existence upon a higher plane; that they may find their point of origin in the world unseen, and may work out their final purpose within the veil. As Job endured his conflict not by reason of any action of his own, not for the sake of the friends whom he saw, not even as an example for the after-time, but for the sake of the unknown beholders of whom he knew nothing—so it may be that some of the suffering, so purposeless and so undeserved, in many lives to-day might be similarly accounted for if we only knew as we are known. In relation to present problems we are situate as were Job and his friends to the

problem of their own day, hence we too have our riddles of life just as they had. Our study of the problem as handled in *Job* should afford a very timely hint that human life involves wider issues than appear upon the surface, and that its activities are further-reaching than is immediately manifest; that, touched as it is on every side by the world unseen, influences therefrom contribute to shape it, while it in turn radiates out its own influences thereto. Hence it necessarily follows that, when we have accounted for and explained experience up to the very limit of human knowledge, there remains a residuum of the unexplained; while this residuum remains no really adequate explanation of the facts of life is attainable. *Job* of course does not tell us, so far as our own personal fortune is concerned, what this unexplained residuum actually is, but it offers a reason for hope and patience. For it does unmistakeably indicate that if it could be known, and we in consequence see our own destiny as God sees it, our experience in life would present itself as quite another thing. The seemingly purposeless would be seen to be purposeful to the last degree, and the dark passages which at times we are called upon to make with no apparent end in view to be in reality a path of achievement by which we are bidden to pass on to the accomplishment of some high enterprise allotted to us as our special service by the All-loving and All-wise.

In *Job* we see a picture of human suffering, apparently undeserved and purposeless; but thanks to a glimpse within the veil afforded to us in the prologue we view it from the standpoint of God. We cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that the whole episode takes on a totally different character when viewed in the light of that knowledge. This we see clearly enough in the case of Job. But in relation to the riddles of our own lives the veil remains unlifted and that hidden knowledge is not vouchsafed.

What we have learned in respect of Job, however, we shall do well to apply to ourselves, and gain courage and patience and contentment thereby. We learn to trust where we cannot explain. Within the veil, it is true, we cannot see; but none the less we know that wisdom and love rule paramount in the Secret Chamber of the Most High.

W. Ernest Beet.

## *THE GOLDEN CALF.*

The story told in Exodus xxxii. is one of the world's great spiritual tragedies. Israel had been led out of Egypt by a man named Moses, one of their own kin who had had an interesting and significant history. He claimed to be the representative of a God whose name had hitherto been strange to them, though under other names he had made himself known to those ancestors whom the various tribes of Israel held to be common to them all. Moses had certainly given evidence of the unique power of this God in the means by which the liberty of the people (or such of them as had been put to forced labour by the Egyptian government), and had led them away into the desert, ostensibly to bring them into touch with this God. His home was on a mountain variously identified as Sinai and Horeb, and when they had reached the appointed spot they received manifestations which assured them of his presence. Moses had held communication with him, and had revealed his name as Yahweh. He had then stated that Yahweh was prepared to enter into an agreement with the tribes. There was to be a mutual adoption by God and people, he was to become their God and they were to become his people. There were conditions attached to this agreement of adoption, conditions which have been preserved for us in Exodus xx. 22–xxiii. But further, as the narrative goes, the people were to receive two stone tablets on which the terms of the agreement were carved by Yahweh himself, and to take them with them in a duly prepared box. In order to receive these tablets Moses was summoned into the very presence of Yahweh in his home on the mountain top. He obeyed the summons, and was absent no less than forty days.

During this period, doubts began to arise. Like all more or less primitive peoples, Israel needed some outward and visible sign of their God, something which they could regard as embodying his presence in material form, which they could carry with them, and before which they could offer their sacrifices and prayers. The promised tablets in their box would have served the purpose, but the tablets and the box were not forthcoming. And where was Moses? Gods were dangerous to deal with, and it might well be that in the place of awe some frightful calamity might have befallen him. The least error, unconscious as it might be, in dress, language, attitude or expression might easily have proved fatal to him. And as the time passed there grew the fear, almost the certainty, that they would never see him again.

The situation became desperate. They had lost their leader and had not found their God. They had been led from a condition which had at least given them a home, though it was the home of the slave, and they had been brought into surroundings where it might be impossible to supply themselves with the bare necessaries of life, food and water—especially water. They would be continually exposed to attacks from the marauding bands of the desert, bands to which some of them had perhaps belonged, and their supreme need was to find some one who could lead them in safety through the wilderness. In their extremity they turned to Aaron, the brother of Moses, who had been associated with him in leadership, and demanded from him the provision of an outward and visible sign of the real presence of the new God. Either because he was afraid of the people or because he shared in their apprehensions, he acceded to their request, and took the measures which he thought necessary to supply them with what they so much needed. A collection was made of all the golden ornaments which the people had about them. At this point the

traditional text presents us with a contradiction. xxxii. 4 apparently states that Aaron modelled the molten gold with tools and made it into a "molten calf." But if the calf were a molten one, he would not have carved it, and it has been suggested that the original text ran "and he melted it in a crucible."[1] If the text be accepted as it stands, it is necessary to suppose that *two* "figures" were made, one of carved wood overlaid with gold, and the other of solid gold cast in a mould.[2] Whichever of the two views is right, it is clear that something was set up as an object of worship, and that some form of cultus was established. The people had at last their God, presented to them in the form of a "calf."

Then the unexpected happened. Moses was not dead, and hardly had their new worship been established before he returned from the mountain top to find that one of the conditions of the new covenant had been violated in spirit if not in letter. The "graven image," i.e. the wooden figure which might or might not be overlaid with metal, had been (apparently) forbidden, in accordance with the same principle of worship which had refused to allow the altar to be made of artificially prepared stone—no tool must be used on that which is to be associated with God. From this it might have been deduced that the "molten image" also was prohibited, and this seems to have been the line that Moses took on reaching the camp. But whatever his reasons, he was violently angry, and proceeded to hold an enquiry. Aaron's defence was to throw the blame partly on the people and partly on chance. They had demanded a visible God, he had taken their gold and had put it in the

[1] So Grätz. But possibly the confusion is due to later modification of the original story; see below.

[2] So Holzinger, who argues justly against Dillmann's view that מסכה might be used of a wooden image overlaid with gold.

fire, and "there came out this calf." The results of Moses' anger and the tragic sequel are too well known to require further elaboration.

Aaron's conduct and excuse have been subject to the condemnation of all later ages. In particular it has been pointed out that his defence is the feeblest possible—a "truly Oriental apology." It seems to be characteristic of the East to lay the blame anywhere else but on the sinner —on other persons, on chance, or on forces over which one has no control. A fatalistic outlook is almost universal, and the very washerman who brings a shirt back in a fragmentary condition will seek to placate the irate owner with the plea that "it was written on his forehead." But it is at least possible that there was more behind Aaron's remark than this.

In recent years the nature of worship amongst the early Semitic peoples has been the subject of deep and valuable research. The impulse given by the work of Wellhausen and Robertson Smith in the world of Arabian and kindred peoples has been reinforced by the wider range of facts supplied by the modern anthropologist and student of comparative mythology. We know now how gods made their presence known. We know how they indicated the particular places where they desired that worship should be offered to them, their homes and to some extent their character. We know how they called attention to special objects—trees, fountains, streams, stones, and the like, which held their presence. But we do not seem to have collected for us any evidence as to the methods by which they explained to their worshippers the special form under which they sought to be represented. Even Sir J. G. Frazer has not yet offered us enlightenment on this point, though it would seem to be a necessary element in the development of a genuine idolatry. There are a large number of forms—

especially animal forms—under which the gods of primitive peoples are represented, and in the case of the adoption of a new god, it may well be that part of the difficulty was to know the exact figure which would satisfy him as an object of worship. The case would naturally occur very seldom, and that may be the reason why we have not fuller information than is actually at our disposal. Is it possible that we have in this passage a remote clue to a practice which, though rare, might nevertheless be the accepted one under such circumstances ?[1]

Most of us in our childhood have played with lead or wax. We have carefully melted it in an iron spoon, and have then poured it into water in order to see what form it would assume. It was often a matter of conjecture and sometimes of considerable disagreement, but there were times when a more or less recognisable figure appeared in the water. Perhaps the commonest identification was "it's a pig!" But the children's games of the later generations are often the religious rites of the earlier ones. It may well be that this was a form of divination. As has already been pointed out, the conditions which would give opportunity for it must have occurred only rarely, and it is quite possible that no other instance may ever come to light. But that does not invalidate the suggestion as far as this particular occasion is concerned. If this is sound, then Aaron was much nearer the truth than our ordinary explanations allow him to be. Of course all suggestion as to a "graven image" or even an image definitely cast in a prepared mould must be left on one side. The essence of the thing lies in the fact that it was an experiment, an appeal to what we should to-day call

[1] I am indebted in part for the conjecture which follows to a suggestion made by my friend Mr. D. Hopkin Morgan of Cardiff. It seems to me to be a good one, and I take this opportunity of including it in the present study, in the hope that students with a wider range of material at their disposal may be able to adduce parallel instances from other sources.

pure chance. But what we call chance was to the ancient mind only one of the ways of securing a manifestation of the will of a higher and not wholly intelligible power. The casting of the lot is in all early records one of the regular means whereby the divine will as between two alternatives may be known. Later Israel had its Urim and Thummim, Nebuchadrezzar rattled arrows in a helmet till one fell out, heroic Greece had a similar procedure with pebbles. The application of the method here is somewhat wider, for there were more than two alternatives. But the principle is the same; the god will make clear what the people want to know. To a primitive people it is of the highest importance to know exactly how its god desires to be represented, and the means adopted for discovering his desires must be such as to preclude as far as possible the introduction of man's will.[1] Divination that can be "worked" by the diviner loses practically all its value.

[1] I am indebted to Dr. A. C. Haddon for the following communication :—

"The only savage parallel I can recall just now is one I obtained from men of the Yaraikanna tribe of Cape York, N. Queensland. I quote from vol. v. of the Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits, p. 221. Part of the initiation ceremony consists of knocking out a median incisor tooth. 'The *langa* (initiate) is then given some water with which to rinse his mouth, and he gently lets the gory saliva fall into a leaf water-basket. The old men carefully inspect the clot and trace some likeness of the form which the clot assumes to a natural object, an animal, plant or stone, or whatever it may be, this will be the *ari* of the newly made man.'

"The *ari* is an animal—or what not, of which as many as three may be acquired by one of these natives, (1) through blood divination at initiation, (2) by dreams by other people. 'The *ari* is thus a purely individual affair and is not transmissible, nor has it anything to do with the regulation of marriage' (*l.c.* p. 193). Thus it is not a true totem, but is probably allied to the guardian genius that occurs elsewhere in Australia and in other parts of the world."

As Dr. Haddon remarks, the parallel is not accurate. If it is not a totem, it is still less a tribal god which is discovered by this means. It is essentially a piece of private "religion" (though one may not be justified in speaking as if it had risen to the true level of religion). The need for such action on the part of a tribe would naturally occur much less often than in the case of individuals, and it is not surprising that other instances have not yet come to light.

We need not assume that the image which actually resulted was large in size. And we are almost certainly justified in suspecting that it was not of any really artistic design. In all probability it would require a fairly free play of the imagination to recognise the likeness of anything in the heavens or the earth or the waters under the earth. But Aaron had committed himself to the test and was bound to believe that some sort of answer would be granted. The choice of objects of worship was limited. It has often been pointed out that in Egypt Israel would have been familiar with the worship of the Bull-god, Apis, and that this may have been the reason why they " chose " this form for their new God. Others have objected that the idea would hardly have been derived from Egyptian religion, since the Egyptian gods, like the worshippers, might be supposed to be definitely hostile to the escaped serfs. But this objection disappears when it is remembered that this is not a case of choosing a new god, but of finding out the form under which a particular deity desired to be worshipped. A certain number of god-forms were familiar to the Israelites, especially those which were in use amongst the Egyptians. It is only necessary to assume that the lump of gold which appeared in the vessel was more like an ox than anything else. There may have been corners projecting here and there which could be held to represent legs and horns. For it has long been recognised that the animal was not strictly speaking a " calf," but that the term was used possibly in contempt, and possibly as applicable even to a beast of mature age. It has always to be remembered that the story in its present form dates from a period when any kind of idolatry was held to be apostasy of the worst type.

This last remark leads us to consider whether it is possible to pierce through the orthodox presentation of the narrative to a more primitive story. It is now generally agreed that

long before the narratives belonging to the older strata of the Hexateuch reached a literary form at all, they were handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation. These narratives were of many different kinds and had different aims and origins. There were those which were concerned with the relationships between the early tribes, those which had an etymological motive, and those which were concerned with the cultus.[1] It is to the last class that the story before us belongs, even if it be read merely as the condemnation of a false cultus. It may be taken for granted that traditions of this type were handed down especially at centres of worship. Thus the story of Jacob's dream will almost certainly have been told at Bethel, and will be held to explain the sanctity of that particular spot. In all probability the great majority of the separate narratives of the Hexateuch once had each an independent existence in this way at one or other of the recognised sanctuaries of Israel. Where will this account of the making of the Golden Calf most probably have been cultivated ?

One's mind passes at once to a holy place which was noted as the centre of such worship, the Temple at Bethel. If there is to be any spot in which the worship of Yahweh under such a form is to be explained, it will be here. And it is almost inevitable that, sooner or later, the Golden Calf of Sinai should link itself up with the Golden Calf of Bethel—for generations the most distinguished shrine in all Israel. It is surely not too much to conjecture that if, in the days of Amos, one had asked Amaziah why Yahweh was worshipped at Bethel under the form of an ox, his reply would have taken some such form as the narrative of Exodus xxxii. 1–4.

Yet there would certainly have been differences. The

[1] Cf. Gunkel: *Genesis* (Göttinger Handkommentar), Einl., § 2. 7c.

most obvious of these would have been that the action of Aaron would not have been represented as apostasy. In later days the very worship which Amaziah himself administered was held to be iniquitous, and the historical character to whom its establishment is attributed in the Book of Kings has been handed down to the condemnation of posterity as "Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin." This was certainly not the view that was taken by Amaziah and other priests of Bethel, and it is equally unlikely that they would have told the story of the Sinai calf as an illustration of the wickedness of Israel. We must look further back.

Very little evidence has survived as to the character of the religion of Israel before the conquest of Canaan. Our knowledge of it has to be deduced partly from the occasional relics that have remained in the midst of the material superimposed by the later Jews, and partly from what we know of the religion of other Semitic peoples in the nomadic or pastoral stage. But there are three emblems of worship which still continued to be reverenced during the period of the monarchy, whose origin is at least ascribed to the time of the wanderings. The first of these is the Ark. This was obviously a box, and the record stated that it had been carried with Israel through all their wanderings and had been brought with them into Canaan. There it had been the centre of their religious life, winning their battles and sharing in their defeats till it found a resting-place in the Temple built by Solomon for its reception. Through the whole of Israelitish history and by every age in her religious development it was regarded as the legitimate object with which worship was connected. But a box can hardly have been *per se* an object of worship. It must surely have obtained its sanctity from something that it contained or was supposed to contain. Tradition held that there were

two pieces of stone in it, stones brought from Sinai with the people, received by them on the day when the Covenant was first made, and treasured by them as the centre of their social and religious life ever afterwards. The character of these stones is a subject on which opinions differ. The traditional view is that they acquired their sanctity from the Law which was inscribed upon them. But closer investigation of that Law suggests that it was a growth in whose final form the pre-conquest elements were very few. Even the decalogues—and it is generally held that not more than one of the decalogues could have been inscribed on the stones —bear unmistakeable traces of an agricultural society. That of Exodus xx. is not called a decalogue, nor do its terms suggest a primitive people. That of Exodus xxxiv. appeals to the reader as being much the earlier of the two, and yet even there one finds comparatively little that would have been appropriate to the life of a Bedawin community. The feasts, except for the Passover, are agricultural, and the Sabbath is an institution which is adapted to a life of tillage rather than to one of pasture. The fields can be left unploughed or unreaped all day Saturday without serious harm, but the cows and goats have to be milked, and the sheep watered and tended. It seems unlikely that even this decalogue was familiar to Israel before the conquest, and if that be so these laws cannot have been inscribed upon the two stones. These and other considerations have led to a fairly wide acceptance of the view that the two stones were originally supposed in themselves to contain the presence of Yahweh. His proper home was the mountain at which Israel had been brought into touch with him, and those who wished to get into the closest contact with him had to resort thither even in the middle period of the monarchy. So whilst he was considered to inhabit the whole mountain, it may well have been held that his presence would

be secured by the possession of portions of the rock. In other words, these stones may be regarded as "Baetulia"—"God-homes." [1] In this connexion it is significant that the most conspicuous references to Yahweh's dwelling in Sinai or Horeb (Song of Deborah, Elijah) are found in circles where the worship of the Ark is not apparent. But the southern tribes, who had the Ark, may well have believed that Yahweh dwelt therein, inhabiting more particularly the two stones.

The second cultus-object was certainly the serpent, of which a bronze figure existed down to the days of Hezekiah, and was worshipped under the name of Nehushtan (2 Kings xviii. 4). There is other evidence which suggests that Yahweh was recognised under this form in Jerusalem. The heavenly beings who appeared in attendance on him in the great vision of Isaiah were "saraphs"—and the "saraph" was the species of serpent whose image was preserved (cf. Num. xxi. 8). It is hardly possible to avoid the feeling that Isaiah, like others in Jerusalem, may have recognised Yahweh to be of the same form as his attendants. And it is worth noticing that, like the stones in their box, the serpent is traced back to Moses. There is, of course, one obvious difference. The stones were believed to the last to be the real presence of Yahweh. The later theology regarded the bronze saraph as an object made by Moses under Yahweh's special direction to meet the needs of the people when attacked by natural reptiles of that species. But if one had asked the priest of the saraph shrine in Jerusalem why he offered incense to Yahweh under that form, there can be little doubt that his story would have represented Yahweh as ordering the construction of the bronze figure to represent himself for purposes of the cultus.

[1] Cf. Marti: *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*, p. 81.

We have thus reconstructed for us a most interesting and important picture of the religion of Israel in the middle monarchy. Yahweh alone is recognised as the true God of Israel, but there are no less than three separate types of the cultus, each of which represents the national God under a different form. There is the Stone-cultus, the Serpent-cultus and the Bull-cultus. These three are struggling for supremacy. In the North the Bull-cultus is dominant while in the South the Stone and the Serpent are both in the field. Of the three, the narratives of the Books of Samuel seem to make it clear that the more continuous literary tradition definitely carried back the Stone-cultus to the nomadic period, and it is the one which is naturally more closely associated with the covenant at the mountain than either of the other two. It is true that there are traces of serpent worship amongst the Arabian tribes. Mohammed found Jinn in the form of serpents,[1] and, as Robertson Smith pointed out, Jinn are nothing more than gods who have been degraded by the loss of their tribes. But, on the other hand, stone heads of serpents are almost as common as those of cattle amongst the débris of the Palestinian shrines,[2] and a bronze cobra was amongst the objects discovered at Gezer.[3] It is fairly clear that a serpent cult was well established in Canaan before the Hebrew conquest, and the maintenance of this worship was a piece of syncretism.

We may now turn back to the Golden Calf. Just as the priests of the serpent-shrines in the South took care to trace back the foundation of their cult to Moses, so those of the North carried the story of their Calf to the same period. But even so there is one detail in the story which will still

[1] Cf. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, pp. 137 f.
[2] Cf. S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine*, p. 32.
[3] Cf. *Id.* p. 15.

further require comment. This is the fact that it is Aaron who makes the Calf. It is significant that this is one of the two occasions on which Aaron acts on his own initiative. In the other case he is represented as rebelling against Moses (Num. xii.). Elsewhere he appears as the mouthpiece of his brother, and is often little more than a lay figure on which to hang ecclesiastical raiment. There is some ground for doubting whether the more primitive forms of the documents underlying the Pentateuch mentioned him at all except in this passage. (In Num. xii. it is clearly Miriam who is the real criminal.) One may ask why it is that he is introduced in this passage, and the most obvious answer is that he was made to be the scapegoat by the later orthodoxy, which could not bear the idea of Moses being guilty of so heinous a sin. In other words, we may not unreasonably conjecture that as the story was told at Bethel, it was not Aaron who made the calf, but Moses himself. This would give a parallel to the serpent narrative.

We are now able in some measure to reconstruct the history of these three forms of cultus. Israel brought with them from Sinai (or Horeb) their portable God in the form of the two stones which were preserved in the Ark. As they gradually took possession of the land of Canaan, it was natural that they should incline to the worship of the gods whom they found there already. The influence of the old faith was strong enough to overcome this tendency to a large extent in pre-monarchic times. But the conquered faith left its mark on the conqueror, not merely in the name given to their God (though it seems that Yahweh was often called a Ba'al), but also in the type of the cultus itself. In addition to many worse features, the worship of Yahweh was carried on under two of the old forms. One of these was the southern Serpent, the other the northern Bull. Each form of worship found it necessary or at least desirable

to refer its foundation back to Moses, whose claim to be the author of the rival cult was undisputed.

But there seems to have been running all through the pre-exilic religion of Israel a double thread. Whilst the great mass of the people, especially in the more fertile districts, combined the worship of their fathers with that which they found in the land, there were others who stood for the purer and simpler creed and cultus which they had brought with them from the desert. Prominent amongst these were men like the Rechabites and Nazirites, who aimed at maintaining the conditions of pastoral life in the midst of an agricultural community. In sympathy with them were men such as Elijah and his successors, the canonical prophets. Their influence reached its height in the latter half of the eighth century, and was sufficient to secure in Judah the triumph of the older worship over the semi-Canaanite ritual. But Northern Israel perished too soon to permit of thorough reforms in this direction. Perhaps also the Bull-cult of Bethel had taken too firm a hold to be uprooted, and the character of the country produced a conservatism in the farmer class which presented a further obstacle. At any rate, the message of Hosea, the first, as far as we know, to protest formally against the Bethel cult, came too late, and Samaria fell.

The tradition, however still remained. That stated that when Yahweh made his original covenant with Israel, Moses had resorted to divination by molten metal to discover the form under which Israel's new God would be worshipped, and the result of that test was that he made himself known in the shape of a Bull. Possibly the figure used at Bethel was of so crude a shape as to justify this opinion. The prophetic party had had to face a similar tradition in the case of the Serpent worship in Judah, and they had solved their problem by modifying the tradition into the familiar

form. A parallel, but not identical method was employed in the case of the Bethel tradition. It had been strikingly and finally condemned by the disaster of 722, and it was possible to represent it, not merely as a misunderstood command of Yahweh which had served its purpose and been superseded centuries ago, but as a direct act of apostasy. Only in that case the character of Moses must be cleared, and this was effected by throwing the blame on that otherwise shadowy figure, his brother Aaron. This left it in a form, which, though not free from objection, was still possible, and in this form it was incorporated into the documents which describe the early history of Israel.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

## *THE PLEROMA AS THE MEDIUM OF THE SELF-REALISATION OF CHRIST.*

EPHESIANS i. 23 is a difficult text. The Greek *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου* is rendered by A.V. and R.V. "the fulness of him that filleth all in all," the noun being taken as a passive and the verb as a middle. Origen, Chrysostom and the Latin versions, however, appear to take the verb in the passive, the first writing, "Christ is fulfilled in all that come to Him, whereas He is still lacking in respect of them before they come"; the second, "the fulness of Christ is the Church and the fulness of the body is the head"; [1] and the third, "*qui omnia in omnibus adimpletur.*" Dean Robinson has gone back to this meaning, "the fulness (or fulfilment) of Him who all in all is being filled (fulfilled)." [2] An interesting theory of Christ's relation to His people has been built upon this revived rendering

[1] Cramer, *Catena in Ephes.*, p. 133. Savile, iii. 776.
[2] *Ephes.*, p. 255 f.

by a writer in the EXPOSITOR,[1] who says, "For St. Paul . . . the Christ is a person, but not a self-contained, completed person; He is, from one point of view, in the making. . . . The Church then is the continuation of the Incarnation, the expression of Christ in the world, His body, that by which His personality comes from time to time into human relationships with mankind; just as the body of any individual man is that by which his personality has dealings in the material sphere with other men. St. Paul said to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 27), and he still says to us: "Ye are the body of Christ and severally members thereof." That signifies that the only means Christ has of expressing Himself in human society is the thoughts, words and deeds of the men and women who profess and call themselves Christians. The implication here is that the Christ is growing larger as the Church, "the Catholic Church in the idea of it (using the term idea in the Platonic sense—the ideal which some day will be realised" (p. 213), is growing larger, and this must follow if we regard the Church as that which fills up and completes the Christ.

Dean Robinson explained the passage similarly: "He (St. Paul) would appear to mean that in some mysterious sense the Church is that without which the Christ is not complete, but with which He is or will be complete. That is to say, he looks upon the Christ as in a sense waiting for completeness and destined in the purpose of God to find completeness in the Church." He admits that this view of the Church as the fulness or completion of Christ is "startling." Colossians ii. 9 he interprets so: "For in Christ dwells all the fulness of the Deity expressing itself through a body, a body in which you are incorporated, so that in Him the fulness is yours." "Thus St. Paul looks forward to the ultimate issue of the Divine purpose for the universe.

[1] March 1921, by N. J. D. White, D.D., pp. 206, 209.

The present stage is a stage of imperfection. All is not complete; in the issue all will be complete. And this completeness, this fulfilment, this attainment of purpose and realisation of ideal is found in Christ—in Christ 'by way of a body'; that is to say, in Christ as the whole in which the head and the body are inseparably one." Again he says, "For Christ is more than the Head. The whole Body, in St. Paul's language, is 'in Him' (Rom. xii. 5); the several parts 'grow up into Him,' even more than this, the whole is identified with Him, for as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body being many are one body; so also is the Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12). In the New Man Christ is all and in all (Col. iii. 11). Identified with the whole Body, He grows with its growth and will find His own fulfilment only in its complete maturity." [1]

We are in perfect accord with the idea of the self-realisation of God in humanity, but the identification of Christ with His own Body gives us to think. In the first place it would require us to modify our conception of the Atonement, which on Scriptural and philosophical grounds is based not upon our Lord's self-identification with the Church as His Body, but with a vaster and wider organism—humanity. See Romans v. 12–21 on the representative character of Christ in His relationship to the race; also 1 Corinthians xi. 13, "the head of every man is Christ, but the head of Christ is God." Our Lord's Headship was universal and representative. His sacrifice was a racial act. Its benefits are enjoyed by those who believe—His Body or Church, but are potentially shared by all, for He is "the recapitulation of humanity" (Irenaeus). This relation to the race is the basis of His Atonement: it gives Him the right to represent, redeem, and rule it.[2]

[1] Op. cit. p. 43; p. 88; p. 103.

[2] See *Atonement and Modern Thought*, pp. 184–216, by present writer.

Again, the passages cited seem rather to emphasise the utter dependence of the Church upon Christ rather than the dependence of Christ upon the Church. According to a saying attributed to Clement of Alexandria "the Church subserves the working of the Lord"; that is, the Church is His instrument.[1] But may one, logically speaking, identify the instrument with the employing power when both are personal? If God realises Himself in the sense of fulfilling His plans and purposes in humanity—a wider sphere than the Church—as the medium or vehicle of His self-realisation; and if humanity in consequence of and owing to this Divine self-realisation in it attains thereby its own self-realisation, the idea of humanity in the mind of God, one may not logically say, even if the self-realisation of humanity be included in the Divine self-realisation of Himself, that God is identified with man, or that God and man are inseparably one. To confuse identification of aims and purposes with identification of being is a logical fallacy. Personality presents an insuperable barrier to self-absorption in another, and all progress of human life and character must be stated in terms of personality. Our personality is never merged in the Personality of Christ nor His in ours. We shall always have that self-objectification, the capacity of distinguishing ourselves as objects, which is the essence of personality. Otherwise we should lose ourselves and our identity in God, which were pantheism. Quite other is the teaching "He who will sacrifice his life shall find it." We do not "lose ourselves in heaven above," we find ourselves in a more highly developed and richer personality with higher ideals, greater activities, expanded powers, and new modes of self-expression.

Again, it is not clear from the passages mentioned that St. Paul identified Christ with the Church when he spoke of

[1] ὑπηρετεῖ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ.

the New Man. This "new (*νέος*) man" who is being renewed unto perfect knowledge after the image of Him who *created* him (Col. iii. 10), that is of Christ, "the image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15) is not identified with Christ, but is the new body of believers in which there is no distinction of Jew and Gentile, but all are Christ's and Christ is in all as the principle of union (Col. iii. 11, *τὰ πάντα* (sc. *Χριστοῦ*) *καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός*). The same idea is expressed in Ephesians ii. 15, where Christ has removed the wall of partition, so that He might *create* (*κτίσῃ*) the two in Himself into one new (*καινός*) man (*ἄνθρωπος*)"; and in Ephesians iv. 13, "Until we all come to the unity of the faith and the perfect knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man (*ἄνδρα τέλειον*) unto the measure of the stature of the fulness (*πλήρωμα*) of Christ." With this compare Milton's "One huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man." Christ is the Creator of this "new man," and in the "all," which consists of apostles, prophets, etc., Christ is not included, and consequently He is not to be identified with the "new man" or "the perfect man." In Ephesians iv. 4 f. the "one body" is distinguished from the "one Lord." In the epistles of the Captivity "the *Headship*" of Christ is emphasised. The Church is now the headless trunk, completed and finding its self-realisation in Him. In 1 Corinthians xii. 12, after saying that the body is one and has many members, and all the members—*head* is included here—are one body, he adds, "So is it also in the case of the Christ." This is the meaning of *οὕτως*.[1] It does not imply identification of Christ and the Body, but a unity of the members of His Body, analogous to the unity of the members of the physical organism

[1] See Luke xxii. 24 f. It shall not be so (*οὕτως*) in your case. 1 Cor. xv. 42: One star differeth from another star. So it is also in the case (*οὕτως*) of the resurrection. See also 1 Pet. ii. 15.

effected by the one Spirit. All the members together form a body (*σῶμα*, not *the* body) of Christ, ver. 27. All have their separate functions, but all are one in Him. They are of diverse habits and natures, but He reconciles them all and makes them work together for the good of the whole. They may not be identified with their creator, in whose image they are being renewed. Indeed to prevent any such identification which might lead to a substitution of the Church for Christ the figure of the Body is modified in the later epistles, in which it is only made complete by the Head.

The expression *τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστός* (Col. iii. 11), Christ is all and in all, or, as we prefer, "all things are Christ's, or in Christ, and Christ is in all things," does not imply identification, but expresses His transcendence as well as His immanence, and the manifoldness of the operations and the unity of the life of the Body controlled by the one Head. Similarly in 1 Corinthians xv. 28, "that God may be all in all" (*τὰ*) *πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*, there is nothing further from the apostle's mind than absorption into God. He has just set forth the complete subjugation of all things to God, not that God might identify Himself with all things, but that all things might be in God and God in all things transcendent and ruling, immanent and inspiring. So also in the case of Christ and His Body, the same phrase expresses the fact that He is the unifying principle of the various elements and organs of His Body, giving it cohesion, nourishment, life and increase (Col. ii. 19). It is thus that we, who are His, shall share in His glory. "For ye are dead, and your life hath been hid *with* Christ" (*σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ*). When Christ who is our life shall be made manifest, then shall ye also be made manifest *with* Him (*σὺν αὐτῷ*) in glory (Col. iii. 3). See also Ephesians ii. 5 and 6, "He quickened us together *with* Christ," "He raised us *with*

Him." In all these cases the preposition σύν expresses fellowship not identification. Christ is the life of all and in all the sphere of His newly created or recreated humanity, not because He is identified with or absorbed in it, or because it completes His Being save in the sense of offering a sphere for His operations, an object for His love, and an instrument for His purpose, but because His Spirit energises in it, pervades, and fills its various activities, manifold developments and many voids. Compare the figure of the Vine and the Branches in John xv. Without or apart from (χωρίς) Christ His members are without the principle of vitality and union. In Him they are united and fruit-bearing. The figure of the Body and its members in Romans and Corinthians is developed into that of the Head and the Body in Colossians and Ephesians. In Colossians i. 22 he speaks of "the body of His flesh" in which He made the Atonement, and proceeds to speak of another body. In ii. 10–19, "And it is in Him that you are fulfilled (πεπληρωμένοι), who is the Head of every rule and authority" . . . "but the body belongs to Christ" (τοῦ Χριστοῦ), "not holding the Head (κεφαλήν), from whom (ἐξ οὗ) the whole body receiving supply of spiritual life and unifying force increaseth with the increase God gives"—the personality of the Head being shown by the gender of the relative.

In Ephesians iv. 16 this dependence of the Body upon the Head is further developed. "Maintaining the truth in love we grow in all things unto Him (εἰς αὐτόν) who is the Head, even Christ, from whom (ἐξ οὗ) the whole body, harmoniously framed and knit together by means of every joint of the supply, maketh for itself (ποιεῖται) increase of the body." This appropriative and intensive middle which denotes the action and purpose of the Body shows that it is not identified with the Head. Christ is more than the

Head of the Body upon which its growth depends. He is the Saviour thereof. When discussing the relations of man and wife in verse 25 f. he says, "man is head of the wife as Christ is Head of the Church, being Himself (*αὐτός*) the *Saviour* of the Body." He proceeds, "Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself for her that He might purify her, having cleansed her, that He might Himself (*αὐτός*) *present* to Himself the Church in glory." This verb *παρίστημι* does not express identification, but conveys the idea of Bride and Bridegroom, a figure that was used by the Master and the Baptist, and by Paul.[1] In this relation the Church is subject to (*ὑποτάσσεται*, *v.* 24) and reverences (*φοβεῖται*, *v.* 33) her Lord, while He on His part rears up (*ἐκτρέφει*) and nourishes (*θάλπει*, *v.* 29) the Church. If there is a reference to the sacramental relation of Christ to His Body in this passage, such a relation does not depend upon the theory of identification. Identity of interests, objects, feelings and ideals do not constitute identification in the case of Christ and the Church no more than in the case of a man and his wife. The former union is a "great mystery" (*v.* 32). It is an ideal and spiritual relation in which Christ is not identified with His Church, but whereas He rules she obeys, He gives grace and she gives reverence to her Head, Saviour, Lord and God.

To return to Ephesians i. 23 the first term to be settled is *πλήρωμα*, Is it to be taken as active or passive, "that which fills" or "that which is filled," "*quod implet*" or "*quod impletur*"? Lightfoot, Robinson and other scholars have taken opposite sides here, the former arguing that the word has always a genuinely passive sense, the latter taking the word here and in many other places in an active sense—that which fills. It is true that there are many classical and

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 2, "That I may *present* you as a pure virgin to Christ." For verb see also Rom. xii. 1, Col. i. 29.

biblical [1] instances in which the word means complement, contents of cup, baskets, etc. There are also doubtful cases, but it is best to be guided by the context and the rule that nouns in *ματ-* express the result of the agency of the verb, as when Hippolytus (1355) called his steeds *ἐμῆς βόσκημα χερός*, "the result of my rearing." At all events we shall see that it would be logically impossible to give an active meaning to this word in several Pauline passages, e.g. Ephesians iv. 13, iii. 19, Colossians ii. 9. The first runs: "until we all attain (*καταντήσωμεν*) unto the unity of the faith, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the *pleroma* of Christ." Take *pleroma* actively, and we have this ideal of Christian life and endeavour, "the full stature of our completion of Christ"! Stature (*ἡλικία*), age,[2] expresses the perfectly realised manhood of Christ and makes His Personality stand out distinct and complete, a royally Divine Life and Being completely self-sufficing and perfect in Himself, so far as His people are concerned, over against the Body of those who believe in Him, which Body He created, calling it out of the world, and desires to sanctify and perfect that it may be the means of saving the world for Him. *Pleroma* here cannot mean "Church" (Baur) without avoiding the circle—the members of the Church are to attain unto the Church! As in the Fourth Gospel, which has many touch points with the Pauline epistles, the Church is absolutely powerless without Christ—"Without me ye can do nothing" (John xv. 5)—and is absolutely dependent upon Christ. He could have created and can create other agencies, whereas the converse proposition has no biblical support. No other agency, not

[1] Eurip. Cyclops. 209, Medea 203, Troades 824, Ion 1,051, Soph. Trach. 1,203. Mark vi. 43, 1 Cor. x. 26, Ps. xxi. 1.

[2] Cf. Lk. ii. 32. Philostratus V. Sophist. i. 543, *τὸ μέτρον ἡλικίας*, the standard age for other scientific pursuits is the beginning of old age. Luke xix. 3, *stature*, John ix. 21, *age*.

even the Universal Church, can create Him. Can it complete Him? We might avoid this question here by rendering—the fulness which is Christ, taking it as genitive of opposition or of definition like ii. 14, "the middle wall which is the partition" (ii. 20), "the foundation which consists of the apostles." Ephesians iii. 19, "that ye may be filled unto all the *fulness* (*pleroma*) of God." There again the explanation, *the Church*, is manifestly wrong. What the Church is to aim at is not the Church, but the perfection of God. The fulness or perfection of God dwells in Christ (Col. ii. 9), and so far as Christ dwells in us, the perfection of God dwells in us. The ultimate measure and ideal of the Body is the perfection of God in His many attributes. so that it may be as full in its capacity as God is in His. Cf. "ye shall be *perfect*, τέλειοι, as your heavenly Father is *perfect* (τέλειος, Matt. vi. 48). This is the end, τὸ τέλος, and final purpose of the existence of the Body. Towards (εἰς) such a *pleroma* progress is made. This is the destination of the life-journey, as καταντάω (Eph. iv. 13) suggests. The verb πληρωθῆτε, that you may be filled, also denotes progress. Cf. John xv. 11, that my joy may be (ᾖ) in you and your joy may be filled (πληρωθῇ.) Here Westcott observed that "Christ's joy is absolute, the disciples' progressive." The same principle of growth is expressed in John i. 16, "out of His *pleroma* have we all received, and grace in succession to grace," taking ἀντί in its original sense, "at end of" (*anta-s*). Ephesians iii. 19 would mean then —that you may be filled to the utmost of your capacity with the grace of which God is full.

This would be a process of ever becoming and never being, and is made possible just because the *pleroma* is not ours, nor of our making, but God's and for our having. for He gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church" (Col. ii. 9). "In Him dwelleth all the pleroma of the Godhead

bodily [1] (σωματικῶς), and it is in Him (ἐν αὐτῷ) that ye are made full (πεπληρωμένοι), who is the Head of every rule." This pleroma is *in* Christ, therefore it cannot be found either wholly or partially outside of Him. Can we say that the pleroma is in the Church and cannot be found either wholly or partially outside of her? Surely not. Neither is it possible to take *pleroma* actively here. "In Christ dwelleth bodily all that fills the Godhead." St. Paul regarded Christ as filled with the attributes of God, not as exhausting them. He had just said, "Christ in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden" (ii. 3). But the order of his propositions are (1) The Body is filled with Christ, (2) the Christ is filled with God, (3) the universe is filled with God. This is the climax. See also Ephesians iv. 4, where from "one body" we advance to "one Lord," and finally reach the "one God and Father of all who is above all and through all and in all"—the grand climax the final and highest step in the ladder of life and thought that ascends from earth to heaven. It were anti-climax to reverse the order and substitute the Church for the Christ or the Christ for the Father, or to say that Christ is filled with the Church and God the Father with Christ. The adverb σωματικῶς cannot possibly mean "through the Church," unless, indeed, one can substitute "his church in glory" for "the body of His glory" in Philippians iii. 21, where the contrast is "the body of our humiliation." With the participle πεπληρωμένοι, made complete, compare Philippians i. 11, "filled (πεπληρωμένοι) with the fruit of righteousness which is *through* Jesus Christ to the glory of God," where the filling of the Body with the fruit is *through* Christ. There is nothing here about the filling of the Christ

[1] "Personally" (Oltramare); "in His incarnation" (Lightfoot, "in His glorified body," "really," "as an organic whole, not fragmentarily" (A. S. Peake), "through the church" (the body), Robinson.

with the fruit of the Body. That would be bathos. The Body, the true believers, is not the treasury of God's gifts of grace, love, knowledge, wisdom and holiness, but is filled or supplied from His full treasury which is in Christ, and may become in due time the fulness of Him who filleth it for Himself in every way. As the members of His Body become filled with His grace and fruitful in every good work they shall fulfil or realize in some measure the object of their existence, which is to render glory to God, and this can only be done *in* Christ, *the Head* (i. 23) over all things for the Church.

The giving of Christ as the Head to the Body was part of the Divine purpose, which was to bring all things together under a new head in Christ *for Himself* (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*). So He entrusted the Christ with the management and stewardship of the fulness or *pleroma* of the times. Cf. Matthew xi. 27, "All things have been entrusted (*παρεδόθη*) me by my Father." The end, the grand consummation of things is the surrender of this trust or stewardship. "When He shall give back (*παραδιδῷ*) the Kingdom to God and the Father . . . then shall He Himself be subject unto Him who subjected all things under Him, so that God shall be all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 28). The Father's will and glory is the final end and object of His appointment. This is expressed in the triple refrain (with variations) "unto the praise of the glory of Himself" (*αὐτοῦ*) in the Ephesian overture. This is no mere doxology but a statement of the Father's purpose on which the changes are rung here and elsewhere, e.g. Colossians i. 19. "It was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him all the *pleroma* should dwell and through Him to reconcile all things unto *Himself*" (*αὐτόν*). Also see Philippians ii. 11, "to the glory of God the Father" (cf. John xvii. 4). The emphasis on the Divine purpose in the Ephesian passages especially militates against the theory of the Church filling up or completing Christ, which is con-

trary to the trend of the whole passage, which is a statement of what Christ is and does for the Church, not of what the Church is and does for Christ. Similarly we have the Son's purpose and idea which He desires to be realised expressed by the participle *πληρωμένου*—"who filleth with Himself and for His purpose—the glory of the Father—all things in every way." This participle is taken as passive by Chrysostom and Vulg. *adimpletur*, but the verb is middle in Xen. Hell. v. 4, 46, "they manned (*ἐπληρώσαντο*) the triremes"; and v. 2, 14, "the general was having the ships manned" (*ἐπληροῦτο*), and is so taken here by Syr. Copt. Goth. Arm. Wetstein gives a parallel from Philo v. Mosis ii. 171, 34, *ὁ πάντα διὰ πάντων πεπληρωκὼς τῆς . . . δυνάμεως*. In the passage *τὰ πάντα* is clearly object. Dean Robinson argues that *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν* should be taken adverbially, as "completely." In the four passages cited 1 Corinthians ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2, Philippians iv. 13 (*τὰ*) *πάντα* cannot be taken adverbially, as they refer to definite objects and matters, as could easily be proved if space allowed. In 1 Corinthians xii. 6 *πᾶσιν* in *τὰ πάντο ἐν πᾶσιν* clearly means "in all men." 1 Corinthians ix. 22, I became all things *to all men* (*τοῖς πᾶσι . . . πάντα*). 1 Corinthians xv. 28, that God may be all in all (*τὰ*) *πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*. This phrase conveys the absolute supremacy of God, but it is not adverbial. In the first stage all things (*πάντα*) with the exception of God (*ἐκτὸς θεοῦ*) are subjected to the Son; in the second stage all things (*τὰ πάντα*) including the Son are subjected to the Father, and so all things, so far from being out of God (*ἐκτὸς θεοῦ*) shall be in God, and God shall be in them all, *πάντα [ἐν θεῷ] καὶ θεὸς ἐν πᾶσι*. Cf. *τὰ πάντα* in Ephesians iv. 15, "that we may grow up into Him, *τὰ πάντα*, in all things, in all the parts or limbs." Then he proceeds to speak of each *limb* or *part* (*μέλους* or *μέρους*). See v. 30, "we are members of (*μέλη*) of His body." *τὰ πάντα* in i. 23 may refer to the

members as the phrase follows *σῶμα*, and the sentence may mean "the Church which is the body of Him who filleth all the limbs or members in every way." The previous references in Ephesians i. 1–22 to the relation of God and Christ to (*τὰ*) *πάντα* (4) and similar references in Colossians i. 16–20 (3) and Ephesians iv. 10—that He may fill all things, *πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα*—show that St. Paul did not use the phrase as an emphatic form of *παντάπασι*, quite, but with distinct reference to things already mentioned in the universal Headship or implied in the special Headship of Christ. As the Apostle considers the grand sum of things in heaven and earth he sees God gathering them all up in Christ as Head, taking them singly and collectively for Himself, for His own glory, while Christ fills the universe of sentient life, all humanity and the various members of His own special Body with Himself, for His own special purpose to surrender them all when redeemed from evil and renewed by the Spirit to the Father so that everything may acclaim and enhance the glory of the Father, who is *above all* and *through all* and *in all* (*διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν*, iv. 6). This phrase and that quoted from Philo, *πάντα διὰ πάντων*, militate strongly against the adverb theory.

In support of *πληρουμένου* as middle we have *πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι* (v. 18), fill yourselves with the Spirit, the antithesis, *μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ*, being "make yourselves drunk with wine" (Lucian, *μεθύσκειν ἑαυτὴν οἴνῳ*). On Hebrews ix. 20, *λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος*, Westcott says the force of the middle is "having obtained as the issue of personal labour directed to this end." This gives a good meaning to *πλ.*, which we may regard as the result of our Lord's own personal work directed to His own personal end. Paul could have written *πληροῦντος* here as he wrote *πληρώσῃ* in iv. 10, had he not wished to emphasise this personal work of Christ. Another reason for preferring *πληρουμένου* would be the rhythm of the line. St. Paul paid attention to the

rhythm and measure of his sentences, especially in this encyclical, where the opening words, *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου*, have when read aloud the swing of a trochaic verse, while the letter closes with an almost pure iambic verse—*ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ*. Take the line

*τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα | ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου*

It is well hammered out and thought out. Note the sound effects of *π*, *λ*, and *ρ*. The line is not faultless, but moves forward with a fine roll. The corresponding line in iii. 19 has exactly the same trochaic rhythm. This cannot be undesigned.

*ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν | τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.*

Cf. also i. 6,

*ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς | ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ.*

The meaning of the Apostle is that as the *pleroma* of the Godhead dwells (*κατοικεῖ*) in Christ by the good will of the Father (Col. i. 19, ii. 9), so it is Christ's good will to dwell (*κατοικῆσαι*) in our hearts through faith (Eph. iii. 16), so as to make us a permanent abode, *κατοικητήριον* (Eph. ii. 22) of God in the Spirit. As He is filled and indwelt by the Godhead, He desires to indwell in His other body, His believers, and to fill them with Himself. These thoughts are symmetrical and harmonise with each other and the whole prelude of the epistle. Will the other idea, that He, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth even bodily, needs a further filling up or fulfilling from His people form a coherent intelligible unity with the rest?

Suppose we take the two propositions, "The Church is filled with Christ" and "the Church fills Christ," can the latter be regarded as the complementary of the former? If Christ reproduces Himself in the Church the Church may be regarded as the vehicle or medium of His self-reproduction, and so in a measure His self-reproduction, that which reproduces Him, but only so far as He reproduces Himself

in it. If Christ expresses Himself, His ideals and purposes through the Church, the Church may be regarded as His self-expression, that which expresses Him, but only because and so far as He expresses Himself therein. If Christ realises Himself and His power in and through and by the Church, the Church may be regarded as His self-realisation, that which realises Him, but only because and so far as He realises Himself through and by and in it.

In this way the Church may be regarded as an extension, expansion, continuation of the Incarnate Lord not because the Church extends Him, but because He extends Himself, expands Himself, continues Himself and fulfils Himself thereby and therein. Irenæus' dictum, "Where there is the Church there is the Spirit, and where there is the Spirit there is the Church," is parallel. So we may say, where the Church is, that is, the ideal and spiritual body of believers, there is the Christ who reproduces, expresses, and realises Himself in and through such a Body; and where the Spirit of Christ is, there is the Church which is the vehicle, channel and medium of His self-communication to men and of His self-realisation in man. So we might render the passage, "the Church which [1] is, or so far as it is, His Body is the medium of the self-expression and self-realisation of the Christ in the Church and of the Church in the Christ as He realises Himself in it and it realises itself in Him. In this way the Church may be described as the self-realisation of Christ. In simpler language, it is through Christ who fulfils Himself in us that we can fulfil ourselves in Christ. As Christ is in us and we are in Christ, Christ becomes all things to us and we become all things through Christ. In this sense we may be said to fulfil Him who fulfils Himself in the *pleroma* of His self-realisation.

F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock.

[1] ἥτις is explanatory and modificative; cf. "covetousness (ἥτις) which may be called, or so far as it is, idolatry." Col. iii. 5, also Gal. ii. 24, and v. 4.

## *THE SIGN OF JONAH.*

### I.

ACCORDING to *St. Matthew's Gospel* our Lord twice referred to the Sign of Jonah. For the first reference we have a parallel in *St. Luke*, and the second belongs to a passage which has its parallel in *St. Mark*. We may dismiss this second reference,[1] however, from our present consideration, since even if it is a genuine word of Jesus, and not an explanatory addition by the writer of the Gospel, it tells us nothing beyond what is indicated in the earlier passage.

Here, then, are the two Scriptures with which we have to deal :—

MATTHEW xii. 38–42.

Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered Him, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet: for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from

LUKE xi. 29–32.

And when the multitudes were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah. For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation. The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgement with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.

[1] St. Matthew xvi. 1–4; St. Mark viii. 11–13.

the ends of the earth to hear the
wisdom of Solomon ; and behold,
a greater than Solomon is here.

It will be observed that whereas both Gospels speak of Jonah as a sign, in *St. Matthew* Jonah is a sign to our Lord's own generation, in *St. Luke* he was a sign to the Ninevites first, and it is as such that he suggests a parallel to the significance of Jesus for His generation. Then there emerges a further notable difference. *St. Luke* is content merely to speak of Jonah as a sign without telling us what he signified. *St. Matthew* expounds the sign as a foreshadowing of the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus. "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale ; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The question immediately arises, did our Lord actually use these words, or did He leave the sign comparatively unexplained as in *St. Luke* ? Professor König [1] regards *St. Matthew's* as the more authentic record. The writer of the article on Jonah in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (i. 895–6), the Rev. Albert Bonus, takes the same view and speaks of *St. Luke's* version as being a "summary report of that in *Matthew*." It must be confessed that, if in *St. Luke* we were dealing with a writer who had an aversion from the supernatural, we should be fairly right in concluding that this was just an instance of a rationalistic watering-down of unpalatable words. But Luke nowhere betrays such a tendency of mind. In fact, his sympathies are all the other way. Like most medical men of his time, or, indeed, like our own Sir Thomas Browne,[2] he was quite ready to welcome the miraculous. Had *St. Matthew's* form of the saying been before him when he wrote, it is highly improbable Luke

[1] *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 751*b*.
[2] Cf. the *Religio Medici*, §§ ix. and x.

would have rejected it in favour of a more general version of his own. Further, the note of Archdeacon Allen in the *International* commentary [1] gives a satisfactory account of the process of thought whereby Matthew, or the writer of his source, may have come to expound a saying of Jesus expressed very much as Luke has given it. We may add that it is strong evidence for Luke's absolute independence of Matthew (or of Matthew's source) in this place, that he does not give us Matthew's order of the verses respecting the men of Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba, although here Matthew clearly has the more likely sequence of thought. We conclude, therefore, that we have in *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke* two distinctly independent versions of what the Lord said, and we have to choose between them. Now it is contended [2] in the defence of *St. Matthew* that, writing after the event and knowing that there was not an absolute correspondence between the three days and three nights of Jonah's incarceration and the time between the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, the evangelist would hardly invent a saying which on the face of it challenged the facts. The answer to this, however, is not difficult for those who have studied the manner of this Gospel, and more especially its decidedly free way of using the Old Testament scriptures. It simply did not trouble the writer that Jesus was not exactly three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. A broad comparison between the lot of Jonah in the belly of the whale, and the lot of Jesus in the heart of the earth, was near enough to enable him to conclude that " the sign of Jonah " found its interpretation here. What did one night more or less matter ? To which our reply is that this may be consistent enough with the mentality of Matthew, but is not germane to the mind of Jesus. Indeed from whatever viewpoint we con-

[1] *Matthew*, pp. 138–9. [2] *Dictionary of Christ*, article cited above.

sider the verse its incongruity with *His* mind weighs upon us, and it is on this ground, and not simply because as a detailed prediction it lacks the verification of events, that we are driven to regard it as an explanatory gloss upon the true saying of Jesus recorded in *St. Luke*. This leaves our way clear for the inquiry, What did our Lord mean by the Sign of Jonah in its relation to Himself ?

## II.

Now Jesus had a way of reading the Old Testament which was distinctly His own. That was apparent to His earliest disciples. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes." Without sharing Matthew's indifference to verbal exactitude, what any particular writer of the Old Testament consciously purposed to say was not a matter Jesus stopped to consider. The Scriptures were the oracles of God, and the Spirit of God in Himself could be trusted to reveal *God's* meanings to Him.

Again, while one hesitates to speak of the cast of His mind, as of a thing made in one mould, for He was occupied with truths that called for many forms of expression, yet clearly He had the poetic temperament, that which sees ideas in the concrete, symbols and parables everywhere. It is an imaginative mind which can exclaim, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven," or again, visualising a story of the past, "Remember Lot's wife."

When, therefore, Jesus thought of the story of Jonah, other considerations than those we are wont to entertain would be likely to present themselves. Questions as to historicity would scarcely arise. Nor did He concern Himself with the purpose for which the Book of Jonah was written, which indeed was quite on other lines than those to which Jesus referred in the passage before us. But He *saw* Jonah the prophet, saw him with all that wonderful

thought-vividness which enabled Jesus so often to speak unforgettable words. It will be noted that although the allusion He makes to Jonah is followed by a reference to the preaching of Jonah and to the consequent repentance of the Ninevites, more was evidently in our Lord's mind than the preaching. It was the man himself that interested Him. And for the moment He saw the man, not in his misanthropy, as the author intended him to be seen, but as a great man. When He went on to say, "A greater than Jonah is here," He certainly affirmed of Jonah a commanding personal value. The man was great enough to be a sign to thousands, a sign of the Divine power.

Can we see the kind of greatness Jesus discerned in Jonah?

*The Book of Jonah* might almost be called a sailor's book. The salt of the sea is in its pages. The picture of the storm surpasses the opening scene of *The Tempest*, where as in *Jonah* the sailors' cry goes up—

> All lost, to prayers, to prayers, all lost.

Even more truly in nautical manner is the saying about the straining vessel, "she thought she would be broken." [1] Now we have in our English Literature another great sea-story, the plot of which revolves upon the sinful deed of one man, just as the storm in *Jonah* follows upon the prophet's dereliction of duty. I mean, of course, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*.

> It is an ancient Mariner,
> And he stoppeth one of three.
> "By thy long grey beard and glittering eye,
> Now wherefore stopp'st thou me?"
>
> . . . . .
>
> He holds him with his glittering eye—
> The wedding-guest stood still,
> And listens like a three years' child:
> The Mariner hath his will.

[1] i. 4. So the Hebrew warrants.

Coleridge makes his man from the sea "a sign" to the wedding-guest. The awful experiences the mariner has been through are stamped upon his soul and have sharpened his eye. There is something uncanny about the man. He suggests that vast and dim hinterland of our nature in which lie the misgivings and vaticinations of conscience, and where "bright shoots of everlastingness" have their home—a world lying outside the ordinary occasions of life, and with which our "eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage" are too generally unconcerned. The mariner thrusts himself into the commoner world, and, for one man at least, arrests its gay flow, because it is laid upon him to tell his tale and speak its warning, and the wedding-guest is held despite himself until the tale is done.

> The Mariner, whose eye is bright,
> Whose beard with age is hoar,
> Is gone; and now the Wedding-Guest
> Turn'd from the bridegroom's door.
>
> He went like one that hath been stunn'd,
> And is of sense forlorn:
> A sadder and a wiser man
> He rose the morrow morn.

The mariner has taken all heart for festivity out of the wedding-guest.

Just so Jonah comes from the sea to Nineveh. He comes as a foreigner, with the strangeness of a far country about him. But more, the sea and its horrors still seem to cling to him. There is a wildness in his aspect. Men cannot shake him off. He is a scarred man, one who has been baptized into an experience of wild waters, a man who bears in his very eye a reminiscence of the hell he has so narrowly escaped. Clearly the Hand of God is upon him. And the people of Nineveh are held by this strange, portentous figure, thus arriving amidst their pleasures and traffic. He speaks his message of doom in words that are

full of awe and anger and utter fearlessness. Spell-bound beneath his preaching, the Ninevites, though notorious for hardness and cruelty, break down all about him weeping like little children. So do the Ninevites repent at the preaching of Jonah.

In some such way we may conclude our Lord intended His hearers to visualise Jonah and to accord him greatness, finding the secret of his power not merely in what he said but in what he was. He *became a sign unto the Ninevites:* a sign, surely, of God as the Consuming Fire, the Judge of every nation, a God full of compassion and gracious, yet who would by no means clear the guilty.

## III.

"So shall also the Son of Man be to this generation."

In what we have considered there lie certain obvious suggestions of parallel between the Hebrew prophet and the Son of Man.

In the first place, just as Jonah came as a foreigner to the Ninevites, so Jesus was wont to regard Himself as having come into Jewish life from another sphere. The thought may not be very welcome to those of us who like to divest our theology of all that is remote from commonplace, but it is a New Testament thought. It is very prominent in the Fourth Gospel. "Ye are from beneath, I am from above: ye are of this world, I am not of this world" (viii. 23). And it belongs to the Synoptics too. In certain places we find our Lord putting Himself in one category and His fellow-men, even the best of them, in another and a lower.[1] And in this there is something of the very life-blood of the Gospel. To understand Jesus even a little we must see what He had in common with His fellow-countrymen, but it is yet more important for us to realise the things

[1] E.g., "He had yet one, a beloved Son: He sent Him unto them, saying, They will reverence My Son."

wherein He differed from them, and how, more for Him than for any of us, earth was, in Wordsworth's phrase, only "a foster-mother."

Then, again, the Hand of God was upon Him, even as it was upon Jonah. He was "sanctified and *sent* into the world." [1] His preaching was of words which were given Him to say, even as Jonah had to preach the preaching Jehovah had bidden him. Deeper still, He was familiar with a sense of pressure. "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." [2] There was a tremendous urgency in His message, especially in the last weeks of His ministry. The pleading became ever more insistent, He could not be shaken off. Indeed, "The people all hung upon Him listening." [3] True, the issue of His work was different from that of Jonah's preaching. This was His lament. But in His own soul He was conscious of carrying the dread aspect of Jonah in Nineveh, the bearing of a man who is so sent of God that escape from the high mission is all but impossible. So was the Son of Man a sign after the manner of Jonah, a sign coming through an experience of God as the Consuming Fire, the Judge, the Everlasting Lord. For in His temptations, and in all His withdrawals into solitary places for prayer and meditation. He was most evidently laden with the counsels of God and given a work to do for the Father. How characteristic of Him it was to say, as He said of His Passion, "Thus it *must* be!"

In conclusion, two illustrations from the literature of missions, foreign and home, may help to make yet clearer what our Lord meant when He spoke of Jonah as being a sign to the Ninevites, and of Himself as being a sign to His generation.

1. When David Livingstone was labouring amongst the

[1] John x. 36. [2] Luke xii. 50. [3] Luke xix. 48.

Bechuanas he wrote of their splendid indifference to bodily pain, and then added, "But when the Spirit of God works on their minds they cry most piteously. Sometimes in church they endeavour to screen themselves from the eyes of the preacher by hiding under the forms or covering their heads with their karosses as a remedy against their convictions. And when they find that wont do, they rush out of the church and run with all their might, crying as if the hand of death were behind them." [1] And if we turn to Livingstone's more intimate journals we see the source of that dread he put upon the Bechuanas, in his own waiting upon God as a man who, in the homely phrase of his own time in Scotland, was "far ben wi' the Almighty." Upon him was laid the sign of Jonah.

2. In the recently published *Life of William Booth, the Founder of the Salvation Army*, there is given the story of Booth's first London convert, an Irish prizefighter. "One morning," says this man, "I was walking towards the public house . . . when I came across General Booth for the first time in my life. . . . I looked at him. He looked at me. Something in the man's external appearance took hold of me then and there. I stopped dead in the street, looking at him; and he stopped, too, looking at me. . . . I could see he was a minister, for he wore a white choker and a tall hat, and I thought he was strange to the place. After he had looked at me a long while, says he very sadly, 'I'm looking for work.' I was taken aback. 'I've got no place,' says he, 'to put my head in.' I got hold of some coins in my pocket, and was just going to offer them to him, when he pointed to 'the boys' outside the public house just opposite, a great crowd of them, and says he, 'Look at those men,' he says; 'look at them!—forgotten by God and man. Why should I be looking for work?

[1] Blaikie's *Life of David Livingstone*, p. 42.

There's my work over there, looking for me. But I've got no place,' he says, 'where I can put my head in.' 'You're right, sir,' I said; 'those men are forgotten by God and man, and if you can do anything for them, 'twould be a great work.' And what made me say that? Sure, it was just the man's external appearance. He was the finest-looking gentleman ever you saw—white-faced, dark-eyed and a great black beard over his chest; sure there was something strange about him that laid a hold on a man." Mr. Begbie adds, "I asked him to tell me whether the preacher did not say anything at that first interview which accounted in some measure for this instant effect upon his mind. But again and again he protested that it was 'just the man's external appearance,' hinting at some ghostly emanation, or psychic influence, which laid a spell upon his senses." (Vol. i., pp. 366–8.) Here, again, is the Sign of Jonah. That arresting "external appearance," the "something strange," was, as the whole biography shows, the outcome of Booth's tremendous inward urgency, his deep sense of the Will of God driving him into his life's work.

He who has the sign of Jonah is one who stands in the great succession of souls that know the scathe of contact with "the devouring fire" and who "dwell with everlasting burnings," souls that have felt the majesty of the laws of God and the indissoluble responsibilities of every human being. And if with all this one knows, as Jesus knew, "the good pleasure of the Father" and is baptized into the Spirit of Jesus, then something more is realised than the Sign of Jonah, indispensable as that sign must ever be; then by the quality of that moral temper which grieved over the doom of Jerusalem, not as Jonah grieved at the lifting of the doom of Nineveh, it may be said once more, "A greater than Jonah is here."

A. D. Martin.

## *THE DATE OF THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS.*

THE primitive apocalyptic writing known as *The Shepherd* of Hermas obtained during the early Christian centuries a wide recognition as a document of inspired authority, and was by many accounted worthy of a place among the canonical books of the New Testament Scriptures. Written at Rome, it is of great value for the light which it throws upon the condition of the early Roman Church at the time when it first appeared. The question of its date is therefore of great importance. Up to the time of the discovery of the (so-called) Muratorian Fragment on the Canon in the middle of the eighteenth century *The Shepherd* was almost universally regarded as a late first-century writing; since then the great majority of students and critics have assigned it to the age of the Antonines. The careful examination of the evidence, external and internal, that follows is made in order that the arguments for and against the earlier date may be duly weighed and discussed.

### *External Evidence.*

The earliest witness is Irenæus. In his treatise against Heresies,[1] written about 185 A.D., Irenæus makes a direct quotation from Hermas, introducing it by the words, "Well then spake the Scripture, which saith." The employment

[1] Irenæus, *Haer.* iv. 20–22. καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα . . . . Ibid. *Haer.* iii. 3. The writer gives the order of the Roman bishops from Peter to his own time and lays emphasis upon the continuity of its traditions. In Rome he declares more than in any other Church, "conservata est ea, quae est ab apostolis traditio."

of the word "Scripture" without any qualifying clause by a writer, who through Polycarp, whose disciple he was, claims to have received first-hand knowledge of the teaching and traditions of the "apostolical" men of the closing decades of the first Christian century, and who himself, during a visit to Rome about 170 A.D., made a personal study of the early history of the Roman Church, almost carries conviction that he regarded the work of Hermas as a product of the apostolical age, i.e., as dating from the time when survivors of the first Christian generation were still alive. At the opening of the third century Clement of Alexandria makes a number of quotations from *The Shepherd*, as a divinely inspired writing.[1] Tertullian in one of his early works in condemning the habit of being seated at prayer suggests that the custom arose from the words, *quum orassem domi et consedissem supra lectum*, with which the fifth Vision of the Pastor opens.[2] May not this be taken to infer that the very ancient Latin version of *The Shepherd*, known as the Vulgate, was already in circulation in North Africa at the beginning of the third century? Origen,[3] later in this century, expressly states that he regarded *The Shepherd* as a work divinely inspired and attributed it to the Hermas mentioned in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Nothing is more remarkable than the length of time in which *The Shepherd* continued to be

[1] Hilgenfeld in the *prolegomena* of his edition of Hermas (1881, p. vi.) gives a list of the quotations in C. of A., and then comments: "Clemens Alex. igitur integro Pastore usus de divinis eius revelationibus ne dubitavit quidem, neque Hermam apostolorum temporibus posteriorem existimasse potest."

[2] *De Oratione* xii.: "Quod assignata oratione assistendi mos est quibusdam, non perspicio rationem, nisi quod pueri volunt. Quid enim, si Hermas, ille cujus Scriptura fere pastor inscribitur, transacta oratione non super lectum assedisset. . . ."

[3] *Comment* on Rom. xvi. 14: "Quae Scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata." Hefele, Patr. Apost. Op. *Proleg.* xciii.; also Hilgenfeld, p xv.

regarded as one of the inspired books of the New Testament. It is transcribed at the end of the great Sinai MS. ascribed to the late fourth or beginning of the fifth century, and it even found a place in the *Codex Claromontanus*, which dates from the sixth century.

The opinion of the early Church might therefore be regarded as strongly favouring a late first-century date for the composition of Hermas' book, and the tradition on which it is based can at least claim to have behind it (as will be shown below) weighty support from the internal evidence of the book itself. In the middle of the eighteenth century a discovery was made of the mutilated fragment of a Latin document upon the Canon, commonly known as the Muratorian Fragment. The authorship of this document, which there is good reason to believe is a Latin translation of a Greek original, has been assigned on solid grounds to the learned Roman ecclesiastic and controversialist, Hippolytus, at some date between 185 and 200 A.D.[1] The writer makes the following statement concerning *The Shepherd* of Hermas[2] . . . "quite recently in our times Hermas wrote *The Shepherd* in the City of Rome while his brother Pius the bishop was sitting in the chair of the Church of City of Rome, and therefore it ought to be read."

In the *Liberian Catalogue* a document largely dependent upon the "Chronology" of Hippolytus, at the close of the biographical notice of Pope Pius, a paragraph is added corroborating the positive statement given in the Muratorian Fragment—"under his episcopacy his brother Hermes wrote a book in which is contained the Mandate, which an

[1] Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, p. i., vol. ii., pp. 405–13.

[2] pastorem uero
nuperrim e temporibus nostris in urbe
roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe-
tra urbis romar codesiae pio eps fratre
eius et ideo legi eum quidē oportet . . .

The text is obviously corrupted.

angel gave to him, when he came to him in the garb of a Shepherd." [1]

Now the Pontificate of Pius I. covers approximately the fourteen years 140–154 A.D. But as Zahn (among others) has very conclusively shown, this ascription of *The Shepherd* to the age of the Antonines is utterly inconsistent with the mention in that book of the name of Clement as a living person, and with other internal evidence. "He who holds the book, despite the name of Clement and many other signs, as a work dating from about 145, must hold it to be a pseudepigraphic fiction, which the Fragmentist throughout does not." [2] But, as we have seen, the "Fragmentist" does not stand alone. He and the writer of the *Liberian Catalogue* draw from a common source the information they give to us about Hermas. It is impossible to test the accuracy of an isolated passage, such as the Muratorian Fragment, but the *Liberian Catalogue* is a lengthy document and its trustworthiness in matters of names and dates is open to serious challenge. The Fragmentist speaks of Pope Pius as having lived *nuperrime e temporibus nostris*, and yet the Liberian compiler misplaces him in the succession of the Roman bishops. He makes him the successor instead of the predecessor of Anicetus. Hegisippus, who visited Rome in the pontificate of Anicetus, and who there met both Soter and Eleutherus, gives the order of succession Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherus.[3] Irenæus, who passed

[1] "Sub hujus episcopatu frater eius Ermes librum scripsit, in quo mandatum continetur, quod ei praecepit angelus, cum venit ad eum in habitu pastoris." Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, p. i., vol. i., p. 254. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, v. i., p. 4.

[2] Zahn, *Gesch. N.T. Kanons*, ii. 115. "Wer das Buch trotz des Namens Clemens (*Vis.* ii. 4) und vieler anderer Anzeichen für ein Werk aus der Zeit vom 145 hielt, musste es für eine pseudepigraphische Fiction halten, was der Frg. durchaus nicht thut."

[3] Euseb, *Hist. Ecc.* iv. 22.; II. *Haer.* iii. 3. Irenæus expressly says that Eleutherus was bishop at the time when he was writing.

some time in Rome,[1] probably when Soter was bishop, likewise places the episcopacy of Pius before that of Anicetus. This blunder is perhaps even more inexcusable than the gross errors which place the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul in 55 A.D., which state that Clement succeeded Linus in 67 A.D., and that the next bishops after Clement were Cletus and Anacletus, these being duplicate names for Clement's predecessor. But it will be said that these two authorities, Muratorian and Liberian, must have had some grounds for their common assertion that Hermas was the brother of Pius. If, as tradition states, Bishop Pius had a brother of the name of Pastor, the possibility of confusion between this Pastor and Hermas, the writer of the book, which in the very ancient Latin translation [1] (the Vulgate) bears the simple title *Liber Pastoris*, is not inexplicable. The biographical notice of Pius I. in the *Liber Pontificalis* according to its earliest form [2] runs thus, "*Pius, natione Italus ex patre Rufino, frater Pastoris, de civitate Aguilaia, sedit ann. xviii, mens. iii, dies iii. Fuit temporibus Antonii Pii a consulatu Clari et Severi. Sub hujus episcopatu* [*frater ipsius*] [3] *scripsit in quo mandatum continetur quod praecepit angelus Domini cum venit ad eum in habitu pastoris, et praecepit ei ut sanctum Paschae die dominica celebraretur.*"

This notice is given in full, as it possesses several features of interest. The fact that Pius is described as "the brother of Pastor" would seem to imply that the said Pastor was a very well-known man, possibly that he survived his brother, and was still an honoured member of the Roman presbyterate, when the original notice about Pope Pius

[1] Contemporary with Hippolytus.

[2] Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, p. 56, shows that the two earliest forms of the *L.P.* were known as the Felician and Cononian Abridgments. The quotation above is that of the Felician Abridgment. The Cononian omits the words *frater ipsius* before Hermis.

[3] These are the words omitted in the *Cononian* Abridgment.

was first drawn up. This original doubtless ended with the words "Clari et Severi," the paragraph which follows being a later addition. Further, the writer of this appended paragraph was clearly unacquainted with the contents of Hermas' book, for this does not contain a single reference to the Paschal controversy. Had he been acquainted with it he would have seen, even in that uncritical age, that the opening sentence of *The Shepherd* raises difficulties that are almost insuperable to the writer, Hermas, being the brother of the Roman Bishop Pius. The words are—"he who brought me up sold me to a certain Rhoda unto Rome." [1] They imply not merely that Hermas had been a slave, but probably that he was a foundling, and that he came to Rome from some foreign country. If he had really been a castaway, brought up by the master, who found him, in a slave household, then clearly the parentage of Hermas would be unknown, and he would not have any brother. But, even if he had been born from slave parents, it would follow, if we are to accept what is stated in the *Muratorian Fragment* and the *Liber Pontificalis* (1) that Pius as well as Hermas was originally a slave; (2) that both were sold and brought to Rome; (3) that in the household in which they were brought up that slave relationships were recognised. But all the suppositions are quite inconsistent with the declaration of the *Liber Pontificalis*—"*Pius, natione Italus ex patre Rufinus, frater Pastoris, de civitate Aguilaia.*"

I have suggested that at the time when this biographical

[1] ὁ θρέψας με πέπρακέν με Ῥόδῃ τινὶ εἰς Ῥώμην.

θρεπτός is equivalent to the Latin *verna* = a slave born and brought up in a house.

Pliny, *Ep. ad Traian* 66, "quos vocavit θρεπτούς qui liberi nati exposti, deinde sublati a quibusdam et in servituti educati sunt. The words εἰς Ῥώμην point to the fact that Hermas was brought to Rome from another land.

notice was originally written the Pastor here mentioned may have been still living as an honoured member of the Roman Presbyterate. For the existence of this presbyter, brother of Pius, rests upon a well-authenticated tradition. There is extant a document of great antiquity—"The Acts of Pastor and Timothy," [1] sometimes called "The Acts of SS. Pudentiana and Praxedis." Pastor and Timothy are presbyters; Pastor being the brother of Pius I. The *Acts* tell of the building of churches in Rome by two sainted sisters, Pudentiana and Praxedis,[2] with the consent of Pope Pius, who consecrated them, allowed baptisteries to be attached to them, and created them into Roman parish Churches. Of the Church of St. Praxedis Pastor was the first parish priest.[3]

If then the statement in the *Muratorian Fragment* (and those contained in the later authorities drawn from the same source) was due initially to a confusion between the presbyter Pastor, the brother of Pius, and the writer of the *Liber Pastoris* (and therefore a blunder) we are now free to turn to an impartial examination of Hermas' book, with the aim of determining its date from the internal evidence of the work itself.

[1] Bollandist, *Acta SS. Maii*, iv. 297–322. Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, i. 672. Bampton Lectures for 1913, *The Church in Rome in the First Century*, App. Note C, pp. 244–7.

[2] Churches bearing these names still exist and without question stand on the sites of those mentioned in the *Acts*. These *Acts* contain letters exchanged between Pastor and Timothy, and a narrative appended by Pastor. Much is fictitious, but the tradition embodied in them has a genuine historical origin. Pastor, for instance, relates that after the deaths first of Pudentiana, then of Praxedis, he buried the sisters in the cemetery of Priscilla by the side of their father, Pudens. That they were so buried is confirmed by the Liberian Calendar and by the Pilgrim Itineraries of the fourth and fifth centuries. It is also related that Pope Paschal I. translated their *Sarcophagi* to the Church of St. Praxedis in 817 A.D. Marucchi, *Elem. d'Arch. Chrét.* iii. 315–332.

[3] Hefele, *Patr. Apost.* of xcv. quotes from Galland, "Presbyter Pastor titulum condidit et digné in Domino obiit."

*Internal Evidence.*

It will be convenient to divide the discussion into the following headings: (1) constitution and organisation of the Church, (2) the reference to Clement, (3) persecutions, (4) New Testament allusions, (5) penitence, (6) Gnosticism, (7) Hermas' nationality.

*Constitution and Organisation of the Church.*—It was not in any way the purpose of Hermas to describe the organisation of the Church, but this fact only makes the references which appear in *The Shepherd* the more valuable as indications of date. The most striking passage occurs in Vision iii. 5.[1] The white, square stones which are being used for the building of the Tower, which is the Church, represent in the revelation made to Hermas, "the apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons, who have walked in godly gravity, and who have discharged their duties as bishops, teachers and deacons for the good of God's elect. Some of these are fallen asleep, some are still with us." These words recall the language of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xii. 28 and Ephesians iv. 11. The word "apostles" in all three passages signifies men chosen and sent out by the Church as missionaries. In Hermas, just as in Acts xix. 17, 28, Phil. i. 1, in various places in the Pastoral Epistles, and in 1 Peter v. 1, 2, we find the titles *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* apparently used to describe the same class of ordained ministers of the Church, the distinction probably being that the title "bishop" is only applied to those presbyters placed in charge of a particular local Church; in other words *episcopus* in the Pauline times, and when Hermas

[1] *αὐτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ διάκονοι οἱ πορευθέντες κατὰ τὴν σεμνότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπήσαντες καὶ διδάξαντες καὶ διακονήσαντες ἁγνῶς καὶ σεμνῶς τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ μὲν κεκοιμηνέναι, αἱ δὲ ἔτι ὄντες.*

Compare for the word *ἐπισκοπήσαντες*—Acts xix. 25, and 1 Peter v. 2.

and Clement of Rome lived was equivalent to parish priest. The term "presbyter" is used in *The Shepherd* in the general sense in Vision ii. 4, 1, 3 and Vision iii. 8. The early date of *The Shepherd* appears also from the statement (in the quotation given above) that at that date a portion of the original group of "apostles, bishops and deacons" were still alive.

It will be noted that Hermas deliberately abstains from classing "the prophets" among the officials of the Church. He was himself "a prophet," and so far from depreciating the position held by the possessors of the charismatic gift of prophecy, he represents the aged woman, the Church, as bidding him to take his seat at her left hand above the presbyters (the seats at her right hand being reserved for martyrs), and he is charged by her to speak the words he has heard from her into the ears of the Saints.[1] In the eleventh *Mandate* an elaborate distinction is drawn between the true and the false prophet; the picture of the false prophet being possibly drawn from Simon Magus. The position of prominence assigned to prophets, and the references generally in *The Shepherd* to the ministry of the Church, are practically the same as may be found in *Didaché*,[2] a document which, whatever the date at which it was compiled, undoubtedly in its account of the constitution and teaching of the later Apostolic Church drew its information from primitive sources. Still more remarkable in its bearing upon the date of *The Shepherd* are the references to those who occupied the chief places in the Church. The words used are *προηγόυμενοι*[3] and *προιστάμενοι*,[4] words

[1] Vision viii. 11, see also Vision ii. 4, 3.

[2] Compare for instance the description of the difference between a true and a false prophet. Hermas, Mandate xi. and *Didaché* xi. 3–12.

[3] Vis. ii. 2 (6) and iii. 9 (7). Comp. Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24 and 1 Clem. i. 5; xxi. 6.

[4] Vis. ii. 4 (5). Comp. 1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 17.

which carry us back to the second half of the first century and to Pauline usage.

*Clement.*—In Vision ii. 4 we are told that the ancient lady (the Church) bade Hermas make two copies of a certain little book, giving him at the same time the following directions as to their destination: "Thou shalt send one to Clement and one to Grapte; Clement then shall send it to the cities outside, for he has been charged with this duty; Grapte shall instruct the widows and orphans; and thou (Hermas) shalt read it in this city to the presbyters, who are at the head of the Church." The Clement here mentioned can be none other than the Clement who became head of the Roman Church in 92 A.D. and who was the writer of the epistle sent in the name of that Church to Corinth. The language of the quotation clearly shows that Clement was not as yet head of the Church,[1] but was entrusted by those who were the heads with the very task he discharged in writing the Epistle to the Corinthians, which bears his name. Further, twice is Hermas called upon to speak of dissensions among the leaders of the Church, Vision iii. 7 (4) and in Sim. viii. 7 (4). Of certain "who though faithful and good were jealous of one another about the first places and a certain dignity."[2] These contentions and jealousies may fairly be taken to indicate that at the time when *The Shepherd* was written the minds of the leading presbyters were exercised about the choice of a person to fill the first place in the Church. It is suggested that this was the case very shortly before the choice was made of Anacletus to succeed Linus, i.e. about

[1] For a full discussion on this point see Bampton Lectures for 1913 Lecture vii., pp. 188 ff. Grapte may have been a deaconess. The name Graptus is found in an inscription of the time of Domitian *C.I.L.* xii. 3637; that of Grapte, *C.I.L.* xii. 4822. Tacitus mentions a freedman of Nero named Graptus 59 A.D.

[2] ἔχοντες ζηλόν τινα ἐν ἀλλήλοις περὶ πρωτείων καὶ περὶ δόξης τινός.

79 A.D. Epiphanius records the tradition that Clement on this occasion withdrew his claim to the succession.[1] Negatively it seems to be impossible that these reflections upon the contentions of the leaders of the Church should have been written by the brother of Pope Pius I. There is not a hint in the work of Hermas that he had any personal connexion with "the chiefs" of whom he writes.

*Persecutions.*—Hermas makes several references to a great persecution which is past, and to a great tribulation [2] which is to come and indeed approaching.

The "great tribulation" is that which is described in the apocalyptic discourse of our Lord recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Such a vivid expectation of the immediate coming of the terrible afflictions which were to precede the Second Advent of Christ is an almost sure testimony to a date not much later than that of the epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter.

The character of the past persecution agrees in all respects with what we know from other sources of the persecution of Nero. Hermas in Vision iii. speaks of those who endured "scourges, imprisonments, crosses, wild beasts for the Name's sake," and in Similitude ix. he exalts the courage of those, who, when "brought before the authority and questioned, did not deny but suffered readily," but speaks of others as "fearful and hesitating, who reasoned in their hearts whether they should deny or confess before they suffered"; while in more than one passage he condemns those who had been "apostates and blasphemers, betrayers

[1] H. J. Lawlor in his *Eusebiana* produces very strong arguments to show that Epiphanius was largely indebted to the lost *Hypomnemata* of Hegesippus, who journeyed to Rome about 160 A.D., and who compiled a list of the bishops.

[2] *τὴν θλῖψιν τὴν ἐρχομένην τὴν μεγάλην.* Vis. ii. 2 (7); iii. 4; iv. 2 (4); and passim St. 'Matt. xx. 10–18; St. Mark xiii. 14–27; St. Luke xx. 10–25, specially St. Matt. xx. 29 and St. Mark xiii. 24.

of the servants of God." [1] Here the character of the sufferings agrees with those described by Tacitus and by Clement [2] in marking the Neronian persecution; passages in St. Peter's first epistle,[3] in the epistle to the Hebrews [4] and in Tacitus fill in the picture drawn by Hermas, that it was the confession of the name of Christ which brought condemnation, and that in the hour of trial a number of Christians wavered, and some went so far as to deny their Master and to betray their brethren.

From the time of Nero onward the Christians were regarded as "enemies of the state," legally "outlaws," and although during the period of the Flavian Emperors [5] there was no systematic persecution of the Christians, their position was exactly that described by Hermas in *The Shepherd*; they were in continual risk of suffering confiscation of goods and even loss of life if, when called upon to take part in heathen rites, or in the official worship of the Emperor, they should refuse to do so on the ground of their faith.[6]

*New Testament Allusions.—The Shepherd* contains a large number of reminiscences of the language of the Gospels

[1] Sim. ix. 19 (2); Vis. ii. 2 (8).

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; 1 Clem. v. and vi.

[3] 1 Pet. iii. 12, 19–21 and iv. 12–19. *Εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι.—Εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ.*

[4] Heb. x. 32, *πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων · ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμεναι . . . την ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε. . . . .* Hermas speaks of having lost his own possessions for his faith, see Vis. ii (1, 2); iii. 6 (6, 7).

That some denied their faith, see Heb. vi. 4–8; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, "igitur primum correpti, qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens." . . .

[5] The so-called persecution of Domitian was fiscal in its origin and rather anti-Jewish than anti-Christian. See Bampton Lectures for 1913, pp. 222, 223.

[6] Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* i. 7. "Sub Nerone damnatio (for the Name) invaluit . . . et tamen permansit erasis omnibus hoc solum institutum Neronianum." Hermas, Sim. i. *passim.*

(especially of the Gospel of St. Matthew) and of other New Testament writings,[1] but in scarcely a single instance does he give an exact quotation. This may be taken as a well-nigh conclusive proof that he was not acquainted with any of the Canonical books that we now possess in their written form; nor is any one of them mentioned by him. His language suggests that he was familiar with that oral Apostolical teaching concerning the life and words of our Lord which early assumed a more or less fixed form, and reproduced what he had heard, loosely, from memory. This piece of internal evidence affords strong corroboration to the arguments already brought forward for an early date for the composition of *The Shepherd*.

*Penitence*.—The chief, indeed one may say the unique, subject of *The Shepherd* of Hermas is to discuss the efficacy of penitence for obtaining remission of sins. The very title of his book is derived from the Angel of Penitence, who appeared to him in the fifth Vision in the guise of a *Shepherd*, and who dictated to him the Mandates and Similitudes which follow. Hermas sets himself to combat the views of the *rigorists* of his days who held that sins committed after baptism had no remission. These views in the Roman Church of the early Flavian period derived strong support from certain passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This Epistle, however, which probably reached the Roman Christians while the horrors of the Neronian persecution were still fresh in men's minds, specially referred in the passages above mentioned to those who in that persecution had either abjured their faith or sought safety by betraying their brethren.[2] Hermas, however, feeling

[1] Chiefly in that part of the book known as "the Similitudes" or parables.

[2] Heb. vi. 2–4. "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost . . . and then fell away it is impossible to renew them again unto repen-

that the acceptance of these *rigorist* views as to the irremissibility of sin after baptism was the active cause of despair and of disorders in the Church, proclaims in his book, as a message which the God of Mercy had ordered him, as a prophet, to deliver, that as a special act of grace at a fixed date once and for all true penitents would receive forgiveness for their past post-baptismal sins, but not for the future. But in announcing this, he, like the writer of the Hebrews, makes an exception to this act of amnesty in the case of those who had been guilty of apostasy, blasphemy or fornication.[1] The language and teaching of Hermas are primitive and point to *The Shepherd* having been written at a date not far removed from that of the Epistle to the Hebrews; they differ widely from the controversy of Tertullian and Hippolytus with Pope Callistus, which concerned the power of the keys, i.e., of the hieratic Church to grant indulgence for post-baptismal sin. This difference is specially marked in the many passages in which Hermas advocates the efficacy of confession, but confession of the individual soul to God; there is no reference whatever to sacramental confession; there is no mention of the intervention of the Church, it is always absolutely excluded.[2]

*Gnosticism.*—There is no direct reference to Gnosticism by Hermas, but in several passages he condemns beliefs and doctrines,[3] which in the time of Basilides and Valentinus were distinctively "gnostic." His personification of

tance, seeing that they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame"; and in Heb. x. 26–29, the wilful sinners for whom there remaineth no longer a sacrifice for sin are those "who have trodden underfoot the Son of God . . . and have done despite unto the Spirit of Grace."

[1] See Vis. ii. 2 (2–5); Mand. iv. 3 (1–2); Sim. ix. 19 (1) and passim.

[2] See Vis. i. 1 (3); iii. 1 (5); Mand. iv. 1 (11); Sim. v. 7 (4); vii. (4) and elsewhere.

[3] See Sim. i. 7; viii. 6 (5); ix. 22.

the Church, of virtues and vices, and other abstract conceptions, and his partiality for the introduction of angels, show that when *The Shepherd* was written there was what might be called an "incipient Gnosticism" in the air. But these rudimentary traces of the doctrines and ideas of second century Gnosticism are to be found in the Pauline epistles to the Corinthians, to the Colossians and to Timothy.[1] Tradition also assigns a strongly Gnostic character to the teaching of Simon Magus who, according to Justin Martyr and Hippolytus, preached with success in Rome in the days of Claudius Cæsar and founded a sect of Simonians still existing in the time of Justin.[2] The doctrines of Valentinus were condemned officially by the Church before 145 A.D., when Pius I. was Bishop of Rome, and it is, to say the least, unlikely that if Hermas were the brother of Pius and wrote his work while that brother occupied the episcopal chair at Rome, he would have committed himself to any opinions which savoured in any degree of those for which Valentinus had been condemned as a heretic.

*Nationality.*—No one has suggested that Hermas was not a Greek by race. He bears a Greek name, and the contents and language of his book point to his having received his education in Hellenic surroundings. The opening sentence of *The Shepherd* tells us that the master who had brought him up (possibly as a foundling) sold him to a certain Rhoda and that as her slave he was taken to Rome. Rhoda, probably herself a Greek lady, in due course emancipated him; and as a freedman he appears, like so many others of that class, to have become fairly wealthy. Dr. Rendel Harris has shown that Hermas, in his description of the

[1] 1 and 2 Corinth. many passages. Col. ii. 11, 23; 1 Tim. iv. 1–3, 7; vi. 4, 5.

[2] Justin, *Apol.* i. 26; *Dial. with Trypho* 126; Irenæus, v. *Haer.* i. 53; Hippol., *Philosophumena* vi. passim; Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.* ii. 14.

twelve mountains surrounding a plain in Arcadia on which the tower of the ninth Similitude was built,[1] follows closely the description given by Pausanias of the mountains which surround the plain of Orchomenes in Arcadia. It is not likely that Hermas read Pausanias, and his choice of this locality for the building of the tower suggests that he was here recalling memories of his early years, and that he was, like the well-known freedmen Pallas and Felix, a native of Arcadia. Dean Armitage Robinson[2] has expressed his opinion that Dr. Harris' supposition merits serious consideration. It is indeed difficult to account for the introduction of a scene in Arcadia, delineated in some detail, into a work so essentially Roman, unless the writer had some personal reason for this sudden transference of his vision to a distant and strange locality.

If Hermas then were a Greek by birth and early training we have in this fact an additional argument against the statement of the Muratorian Fragmentist, that he was the brother of Pope Pius I., since this Pope is described in the *Liber Pontificalis*[3] as being an Italian by nationality of the city of Aquileia. He is certainly the first bishop of Rome after Clement to bear a Latin name.

GEORGE EDMUNDSON.

[1] Sim. ix. 4–10.

[2] Barnabas, Hermas and the *Didaché*.

[3] "Pius, natione Italus ex patre Rufino de civitate Aquileia." Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, p. 58.

## *THE TEMPTATION.*

THE temptation of Jesus was not primarily the struggle of a man fighting to maintain his personal virtue against untoward hostility. It was not an adventure in character such as Dante describes in the opening of the *Inferno*. Yet the prevailing interpretation inclines to such a view in that it regards the three symbolic acts as tests of individual honour coming from the appeal of appetite, the love of ambition and the desire for power. The danger lurking in this explanation is that it may imply a defective ideal on the part of Jesus. We must not ascribe to Him a susceptibility to motives which the high-minded person of to-day would reject without a question. We must find in this conflict an appearance of grandeur and wisdom conformable with what we know from other sources of Jesus. The issue must be adequate to His personality.

The temptation concerns His mission rather than His character. It was not of private but of universal bearing, and touched upon His relation to the world. Back of it lay the convictions and hopes of the most religious nation of history. The spiritual thought of the Jews flowed in the channel of Messianism. Their views of the Messiah varied greatly and there was no universally accepted programme, but all the nobler minds had been searching how and in what manner of time the Lord would reveal Himself on the earth. The temptation gives evidence that Jesus was in this regard at one with His people, as indeed we should expect. How could He for whom the questions of the soul had been the most pressing since childhood, remain indifferent to the deepest issue of the time? We should look to Him as the most powerful exponent of Messianism, for religious ideas that are nebulous

in the minds of the people are condensed into definite shape in religious leaders. We gather therefore that this was not the first occasion on which Jesus considered the ideal of the Messiah. He had long since come to accept the purely *spiritual* aspect of the kingdom. The temptation receives its chief meaning when we regard it as the direct sequel of His Messianic self-consciousness, as the upheaval in His spirit following upon the divine call at baptism to the office of the Messiah. All His previous thinking now takes on a new significance as He realises that everything depends upon Himself. As if by a flash of lightning He sees the way before Him. The veil is lifted and He traces the course of the tragic drama of a spiritual kingdom seeking to win its way in the midst of gross materialism. He appreciates the tremendous forces that are arrayed against His ideal, and yet in spite of this He deliberately adheres to the high spiritual standard according to which the will of God was to be the single rule of conduct.

The three forms as given in the Gospels do not represent three master tests of inner virtue, but rather three distinct paths along which He as Messiah may complete His work. (1) The first temptation according to Matthew and Luke consists in an appeal to hunger, a matter that is of deep import in every age. And for Jesus the chief concern is not His own appetite but the appetites of others. Everywhere He sees how anxiously the labourer seeks his daily bread. From childhood He had been acquainted with the lot of the poor. The ominous shadow of hunger had perhaps often rested near His own home. He was therefore no stranger to the fears and unrest with which the people faced this eternal bread question. Now under the stimulus of personal starvation He conceives of a mission for Himself in which He may meet these physical needs of men. Will it not be a sufficiently noble purpose in life to throw Himself

body and soul into the cause of the poor, that He may right the wrongs of the people, redistribute the supplies and fulfil the rôle of a *socialistic* Messiah ? This ideal would appeal to the deep compassion of His heart and be in conformity with many of the words of scripture ; for many of the prophets had presented to the people a future kingdom where physical satisfaction was one of the ruling features. But He turns from this path of service because He is convinced that there are higher ideals than those which socialism presents. Not that He undervalued the bread problem. His answer implies that he had seriously considered and amply recognised its claim. " Man shall not live by bread *alone*." But the demands of the spiritual are ever present with Him, man must live " by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The word of God is bread indeed. He thus determines that He cannot use His powers merely for the physical well-being of the people. He is unwilling to rest the kingdom on so imperfect a foundation as that of freedom from pain or want. Something more substantial and noble must be found. Jesus cannot regard Himself as a benevolent and unselfish ruler distributing free corn to His subjects. He cannot be a dealer in bread. This limitation of His powers would inevitably lead to much misunderstanding and opposition. It was the choice of a lonely career without any of the joys of popular favour. It was an ideal which few could appreciate. He would be offering the bread of life to men who wished only the bread that perisheth.

When we ask how far He adhered to this resolution in His subsequent career, the Gospels show us quite clearly that He in no way faltered from this high calling. Of course He could not fail to express His sympathy with the sufferings of the poor and sick and down-trodden. His miracles of healing, His love for the weak, His friendship

with the outcast, are too familiar features in His life to require further comment. He taught that the heavenly Father knew that they needed these gifts of the body. That these traits of mercifulness were conspicuous in His life and doctrine is apparent from the teaching of the Epistles.

But the Gospels do not present a socialistic Christ. He never measured by a materialistic standard, nor was He the cause of any revolutionary party that advocated the breaking up of the social order. We do not find His followers disgruntled with their lot and clamouring for a larger wage and less work. On one occasion when He had fed the five thousand and they sought to make Him a king He fled from this offer of a bread crown. The gospel was preached to the poor, only it was a spiritual gospel. His followers must trust in the care and love of the Heavenly Father, must not take thought what they shall eat or drink. Life consisted not in the abundance of things that one possessed. It would profit a man nothing if he gained the whole world and lost his own soul. Thus His work was the logical outcome of the decision made in the wilderness. He continued to treat these outward evils as symptoms, while His daily task was to touch the inner causes of the disease. He knew that the ultimate hunger of the soul was for God; and He could not allow Himself to be diverted from His spiritual mission by any appeal of the body however powerful and popular it might be.

If this be the correct view of the first temptation, it renders impossible every socialistic explanation of Christianity, of which the most familiar example is that of Kalthoff who derives the new faith from the social revolution among slaves seeking freedom. He thinks that there was a Jewish Messianism that was assimilated with the associations among the proletariat (collegia). He holds that Messianism was essentially a dream of social justice, seeking its realisa-

tion in an organisation of the world on democratic and communistic lines. But by this decision in the wilderness Jesus deliberately set aside every suggestion of a mere socialistic kingdom and proclaims a spiritual rule of God. This His followers fully understood, for except for the partial and brief-lived communism of Acts ii. 45 there was no attempt to break away from the conditions into which they had been born. Note St. Paul's advice to the slaves 1 Corinthians vii. 24. From the commencement of the public ministry Jesus must have persisted in laying full emphasis on the spiritual nature of the kingdom in contrast with the temporal and national ideas of the time.

(2) Following St. Luke's order we come to the second temptation where Satan makes the offer of all the kingdoms of the world on condition that He should fall down and worship him. Some think that in this the dream of a worldly kingdom passed before the mind of Jesus and that He here considered seriously the use of military force in an attempt to gain the throne of the Cæsars. But we must be on our guard lest we ascribe to Him a smaller measure of wisdom and high resolve than we require in our leaders of to-day. We do not presume that Jesus considered for a moment the literal use of the sword. We cannot think of Him as a cheap revolutionist such as the Jews not unfrequently produced from their lower and discontented ranks. The consideration of prudence would keep Jesus back from embarking on so dangerous a career, to say nothing of the tenderness of heart that would shrink from war. Yet this temptation did deal with the problem of empire, and it is possible that Jesus seriously considered the wisdom of employing the aids of the state. Could He not work in league with the authorities of the empire and not arouse their hostility ? Could He not regard this universal peace and all the prestige and security of empire as the " pleroma "

or "fulness of the times" predicted in the scriptures? Had not the Gentile Cyrus been regarded as the Lord's anointed? Instead of antagonising might He not propitiate Cæsar? We thus read this second phase as a very subtle appeal involving many fine points in the highly casuistical matter of state compromise. Might He not accomplish more for His spiritual ideal by seeking the support of that overshadowing empire whose authority was in those days accepted with an almost religious consent?

But the suggestion assumes in His mind the aspect of an awful alternative, a final choice between good and evil. To compromise with the state involves an act of worship: it is bending the knee to Satan. The exact application of the words "fall down and worship me" is not clear. Under certain conditions one would think of the emperor-worship which ere long was to be the great recruiting call for the army of martyrs. In Revelation ii. 13 we read of the example of Antipas "my witness," "martyred in your midst," who in all probability suffered by reason of his refusal to bow the knee to the image of Cæsar. It is instructive to notice that in this passage the home of this cult is regarded as the seat of Satan, "where Satan sits enthroned," "where Satan dwells." The similarity in language between this passage in Revelation and the second temptation raises the question whether Jesus was thinking definitely of the Cæsar cult, or whether the words of Revelation are an echo of the temptation. Already, fifty years before this, altars and shrines had been erected to the worship of Augustus in Asia, and happenings in one part of the empire would soon be known elsewhere. Palestine had many points of contact with the other provinces, as the passage of Saul from Tarsus to Jerusalem for education will illustrate.

But granting that there is no such explicit reference

to the worship of the Emperor we have no difficulty in grasping the issue. Jesus saw that the rule of Rome was built upon foundations which He could not accept, upon brutal force, upon intrigue, upon the worship of the world. To compromise with Rome was to accept the world. Jesus saw that only one object could be worshipped and He had chosen God. To work in league with Rome was disloyalty to God. From this we gather that the eye of Jesus traced clearly the place to which His loyalty would lead Him. It involved sooner or later a definite conflict with the state, so that the shadow of the Cross may already have begun to fall upon His path. Already His Messianic consciousness is a suffering consciousness. One who could so clearly recognise the alternative in His choice would be expected to see with equal clearness the consequence of such a choice.

It is instructive to use this second temptation as a light in which to read those passages in the Gospels which touch upon the relation of the kingdom of God to the state. (*a*) There are those verses about His own fate which recur at impressive periods of the story, showing how much He brooded over His eventual arrest by the imperial authorities. His sensitive mind shrank from the vulgar publicity and cruel procedure of a public trial, and He apparently was tortured by picturing the humiliating details which He must endure. (*b*) There is the group of sayings in which He warns His disciples that they must also be prepared for similar arrest and trial. They will be taken before kings and governors. They must not fear those who can kill the body. They need not prepare beforehand what they are to say. (*c*) In line with these are the many demands for public confession of His name, probably before the rulers of the state. They will require great valour if they are to maintain this complete loyalty to Him, only the reward will far

outweigh their sufferings, since the time will come when they will be confessed before the Father in Heaven. (*d*) Along with this must be noted the conspicuous place given in the Gospels to the trial before the Roman authorities. Jesus dies by the sentence of the state, an imperial victim.

This problem of the kingdom and the state continued to absorb the attention of the Church. We seem to trace in the earlier days a tendency to conciliate the authorities of Rome, and certain passages in *Acts* attempt to present the rulers of the state as favourable to the new religion; but this is not the prevailing attitude. It soon became manifest that the disciple had to make a definite choice between Christ and Cæsar. Are we not at liberty to regard the large number of sayings in the Synoptists on this question of loyalty to Christ as evidence of the interest which this matter had for the early Church, and perhaps also as showing that persecutions for the name of Jesus may have been earlier and more general than is sometimes thought?

And in this severe trial appeal was made to the example of Jesus. When the loyalty of the disciple was being put to the test, and when the thought of some compromise may have crossed his mind, it was a consolation to know that the Master had been subjected to the same trial. Jesus also had been asked to worship at the shrine of Satan. The temptation of the disciple was thus brought into line with that of Jesus. But there was greater encouragement from the thought that Jesus had actually been brought before the representative of Cæsar. He too had made His loyal confession even to the death, and in this He was at one with them. This may account for the inclusion in the Apostles' Creed of the article "suffered under Pontius Pilate," which is the only event of His active ministry mentioned in this symbol. When the timid follower of Jesus was summoned to make the fatal choice he was buoyed

up by the remembrance of that Creed which he had learned at baptism, and he drew confidence from the thought of His Master standing before Pilate confessing His loyalty to God. This is brought out in an article in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, January 1922.

(3) In the third temptation, according to St. Luke, Jesus is urged to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, and angels will protect Him if He falls. Some think that He is being persuaded to make a personal display of miraculous power and thus awaken faith in those who behold Him. This, however, is not a sufficiently appealing motive, for while it is true that the Jews were eager for signs and that Jesus persistently refused to make any concession to this demand, yet this He would do from a feeling of self-respect without any struggle on His part.

Remembering that all explanations are necessarily symbolical may we not use considerable freedom and regard the pinnacle of the temple as the symbol of the entire priestly order, the system of organised religion among the Jews? In this case the temptation turns on the question whether He might not carry forward His mission within the official confines of the Jewish faith. Where could He find larger scope for His powers than with the ordained leadership of Israel? The temple was the house of God and the natural centre for all spiritual revival. Jesus must have seriously contemplated the possibility of working in league with the organised Church. What opportunities, what comfort, what splendour, what prestige would not this highly elaborate institution offer! If there were defects in the system might He not work from within and purge out the false leaven? Instead of antagonising the Jewish authorities might He not by patience win them over to His view?

It is possible that the scripture with which Satan presents his offer was meant to stimulate the belief so prevalent

among the Jews that God would under all circumstances protect His temple and defend the system. Heavenly forces were ever on guard; the angels would be the constant protectors of the temple.

But the final decision of Jesus was adverse. He cannot join the ranks of organised Judaism, or co-operate with the officials from Jerusalem. He cannot start His mission from the pinnacle of the temple. He knew from observation how degenerate were the leaders of the nation. The temple had become a "den of robbers." He must work outside the Church. It was probably one of the bitterest drops in His cup of sorrow that He had thus to start His stream from other fountains than the temple, and it may be that Luke realised the severity of this trial and placed this in the third and culminating position.

In His reply Jesus meets the national prejudice that God would under all circumstances protect the system. He asserts that there is a point beyond which the divine patience will cease. To reply upon the system was to tempt God: it was presumptuous sin: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The Synoptists confirm this interpretation by giving instances of His early conflict with the officials of Judaism. They make it clear that Jesus knew from the beginning of His ministry that He must be prepared to clash with the priests. The two ideals of divine Providence were radically different. The Jews held firmly to the belief that God would never forsake the sacred institutions of the past, that the temple was inviolate. Jesus took a moral and progressive rather than a national outlook, and felt that neither temple nor nation could survive the religious degradation of the leaders. He taught that the temple would be destroyed, that the national hopes would fail. A new temple was to rise out of the ruins of the old; a new nation was to be formed as it were

from the common stones of the street. May we not under such circumstances use the Johannine narrative of the cleansing, ii. 14–22, as subsidiary evidence of the fact that at a very early date Jesus recognised how fateful the temple would be in His career ?

Therefore in all these cases Jesus feels Himself being driven further and further in the path of isolation. His burden will be the absence of all human sympathy. He must travel a solitary road, must tread the winepress alone. In the first reported use of the parabolic method in Mark iv. 12 He appeals to the example of Isaiah as typical of His own case. He also has been called to speak to those whose eyes are closed, whose hearts are hardened. But it is just in this that we behold the sublimity of His character. Fully alive to all that is involved in His choice He adheres to His ideal. This is courage indeed, and it flows from the only fountain that is never exhausted. When the tide of powerful emotions, including ecstatic hopes and desolating fears, flooded His mind as a result of the new sense of Messianic vocation, and threatened to carry Him away from His moorings, He was able to abide by the faith formed probably when He was quite a child. He brings each suggestion to the simple test of the divine will. Each reply finds Him beneath the shadow of God, whose word He accepts, whose name He worships, whose rights He respects. A new type of life has appeared on earth where the will of the Father is supreme. His spiritual ideal has come into the field of action and has prevailed over the antagonist. The kingdom of God has begun.

If this reading of the temptation be accepted, then we have the earliest possible evidence of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and we may fairly use it as a defensive weapon against that school, represented by Professor Bousset in Germany and Dr. Lake in America, which reduces Jesus

to a rank of comparative insignificance, which denies that He claimed to be Messiah, and ascribes the notable features of His portraiture to the creative mind of the Christian community.

Dr. Wernle in his effective reply to Bousset entitled *Jesus und Paulus*, has shown how difficult it is to get rid of this Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus. He goes back of the community to the mind of Jesus and claims that the Messiahship of Jesus is the crucial issue at the trial, is necessary to make the confession at Cæsarea Philippi intelligible, and is bound up with the teaching on the kingdom. One wonders why he halted at this point and did not include the temptation, which furnishes such clear testimony: for it is either a Messianic temptation or a pure invention. But the story, contained in all the earliest sources, is so in keeping with the subsequent career, is so manifestly a shadowing forth of His plan of life that we require very convincing proof ere we deny its genuineness.

J. W. Falconer.

## *THE "MEN" OF THE NORTH.*

"THE Men" in the North of Scotland were so called to distinguish them not from women but from ministers. They were prominent religious figures, often but not necessarily elders or catechists, exercising the gift of public speech in prayer and exhortation especially in connexion with the preparatory services on the Friday before Communion. This day, indeed, was known as the "Men's Day," or the "Day of the Question," the custom being for the "Men" then to thresh out some text or passage suggesting a "question" regarding experimental religion.

In Stornoway and the North-western districts they still exercise their old function, but in general their great period lies round about the year 1800. Their position or status was unofficial yet most definite. The formal recognition of their standing would seem to have been the invitation to take part in one of these Friday meetings. Thus we are told that Donald Macpherson of Eriboll encouraged his young friend Robert Macleod by telling him that this would be a sign to him that his public testimony would be blessed. "You will be called to speak thrice the very first day you are called to speak in public." So it fell out; for Mr. Lachlan Mackenzie, the famous minister of Lochcarron, called upon him shortly afterwards to speak to the question one Friday; and as, in his surprise and embarassment, he said but little, he called on him a second time later on in the meeting. His second contribution to the discussion so impressed the gathering that finally he was asked to conclude the service with prayer.

These "Men" wore a distinctive dress, a long blue cloak and a cotton handkerchief bound round the head. Examples

of the questions are, "Walk as children of the Light"—what marks then distinguish the children of the Light from those who are still in darkness? "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness"—what are the scriptural marks of these? A short account is given of "the men" in the "Annals of the Disruption," which quotes an eloquent description written in 1859 by the Rev. Eric Findlater of Lochearnhead, of the open-air services held in his father's parish of Duirnish. The audiences, he says, would be about a thousand persons, consisting of all sorts and conditions of the population. The "Men" whom he recalls with loving admiration and reverence suggest to his imagination various Bible characters, such as the apostle John and the prophet Ezekiel; all were thrilling speakers.

The "Men" are a characteristic element in the religious life of the Gaelic-speaking districts of Scotland, and, indeed, for generations its most striking feature; the idea therefore very naturally occurs that in the story of the "Men" may possibly be found the key to the distinctive development of Highland piety. What was their origin? Were they the peculiar product of some particular circumstances, and did they then mould and fix the characteristic form of Highland religion? Or were they rather typical representatives of tendencies racial or local? Do they stand as a body for any definite movement or inclination in doctrine or worship? In view of the influence, out of all proportion to numbers, that the Highlands have exercised on the religious life of Scotland, such questions demand an answer.

In approaching the question of the origin of the "Men" it is well, seeing that the very word "Highland" calls up in our imagination the eternal hills and suggests an immemorial antiquity, to notice that no thread of historic continuity is to be looked for between Highland religion

and pre-Reformation piety. Professor Macewen speaks (*Church Hist. Scot.*, vol. i., chap. xviii.) of the large outlying districts of Scotland that remained up to 1500 A.D. at least outside the life of the nation. "The Western Islands were in turmoil and the population half-savage." The disorder in Perthshire lasted till the close of the fifteenth century. In the Western and North-western Highlands church order and life reached a very low ebb. In the sixteenth century the districts in question had been but partially Christianised, and were pervaded by Celtic and Scandinavian superstitions. "Turning to more civilized districts," says Prof. Macewen, after these allusions to the North and West. Earlier in his History he has, of course, had occasion to review the results of St. Columba's great mission, and these are the judgments he passes: "there is no case in which devoted and successful work . . . has been so swiftly and completely submerged"; "in the West and North-west the branch missions of Iona were all but obliterated."

The backward state of a large part of the country has thus to be borne in mind in thinking about the growth of the Gaelic church; and connected with this is the important geographical fact that the route to the Highlands was none of the modern lines of communication, but the road along the coast by Aberdeen and Elgin to Inverness, Tain and Dornoch. While there were bishoprics bearing the names of Dunkeld, Moray and Caithness, to which wide mountainous districts were assigned, the bishops' seats were situated on the borders, at Dunkeld, Elgin, Dornoch. Aberdeen was the accessible university for places now finding Glasgow or Edinburgh more convenient centres. Right up to 1843 A.D. almost all the ministers of Strathspey were educated in Aberdeen.

It was in the fertile low country round and north of

Inverness that the Reformed religion took early root; and from this base evangelical Presbyterianism eventually conducted its penetration of the North-west. The suggestion has been made that the beginnings of characteristically Highland religion can be traced to the Reformation and Covenanting periods. In 1563 A.D. the General Assembly appointed Mr. Donald Munro to be commissioner of Ross; and seven years later the "Good Regent" presented a pulpit to the church at Tain as an acknowledgment of the people's zeal for the faith. By 1574 A.D. ten Presbyterian ministers are known in this district. In 1613 A.D. the Rev. Robert Bruce of Edinburgh was banished to Inverness. He spoke of his exile as "this lingering death," but nevertheless exercised a diligent ministry there both on Sundays and on week-days, as a result of which prayer-meetings were founded. Probably it was in 1622 on setting out upon his second banishment that he said, "I go to sow a seed in Inverness that shall not be rooted out for many ages." Tradition says that folk came to hear him from as far as the parishes north of Cromarty. The Rev. G. R. Macphail of Dundee, writing in Hastings' *Encyc. of Religion and Ethics* on "The Men of the North," would find in this movement the origin of the "Men"; but no evidence is to be found of any particular connexion between these meetings and the activities of the "Men" which become noticeable more than a hundred years later.

Another suggestion is put forward in an article in the *Catholic Presbyterian* (VI., p. 445), which is quoted in Johnstone's *Treasury of the Covenant*; namely, that the hot discussion in the Aberdeen Assembly of 1640 about irregular meetings should be looked upon as throwing light on the beginnings of—to quote the words of the article—"a system of lay religious activity which has long had very notable results in the Northern Highlands of Scotland."

The Aberdeen discussion, however, referred to meetings in the South-west of Scotland.

It is true that lists exist of chiefs and clans who promptly declared themselves Protestant at the Reformation; but while the Roman Church was conducting a very vigorous counter mission in the North and West, it is only in the Beauly Firth district that any evidence is found of the advance of the Reformed religion. On the contrary, in 1647 "the desolat condition of Badenoch be reason of the vacancie of all the kirks" is reported to the General Assembly with the addition that Gaelic ministers alone would be of service there. The report proceeds, "as likewise did humblie represent the fearful state of Lochaber . . . since the Reformation never hath there been any care to fill these (three) churches with any minister at all, and so to this hour the people were never taught if Christ came into the world, or that there is a Sabboth, or a life to come." "The first marked impression on the people of Lochaber," says Prof. Macleod of Inverness, "was in the beginning of the nineteenth century, under the preaching of the Rev. Robert Macgillivray." Around the Beauly Firth, however, the Covenant of 1638 was largely signed both by chiefs and people, and from the Northern province and Argyllshire about a score of ministers came to the Assemblies of 1638 and 1639. Mr. Macgillivray, writing in 1859 from memories of his boyhood, when, he says, he had been "much in the society of aged ministers and Christians," finds the decisive factor in the comparatively advanced religion of Ross and Sutherland at this period in the fact that the Earl of Sutherland, Mackay of Reay, and Munro of Foulis, three great feudal chieftains, had raised regiments for the help of Gustavus Adolphus soon after 1630, and that many veterans returned from the continent thoroughly imbued with evangelical doctrine. It was in this district and in Argyll

where the Campbell influence was strong that ministers were ousted in 1662 for their adherence to Presbyterianism. In 1672 "outed" ministers formed themselves into the "Field" Presbytery of Moray. To Ross belonged Fraser of Brea and James Hogg. The persecution endured by these and others gives the North the right to claim her martyrs of the covenant. It is said that many of the "outed" ministers of the south country went beyond the Tay, and in Ross there were certainly refugees. In 1666 the Bishop of Moray and Ross prays for the removal of Westland exiles from his bounds; and in 1676 a commission was appointed to suppress conventicles in Moray and Ross and Aberdeen. But over the Highland area the suffering party was small, and there is no ground to suppose that any organisation grew up similar to the "societies" and "correspondencies" of the South, which there gave a rallying-point to the Secession and Relief Churches a century later; or indeed that the experiences of the Covenanters lent any colour to the trend of Highland piety.

It is in the eighteenth century that the Presbyterian Church really began to take root in Gaelic-speaking Scotland. The Rev. John Mackay says indeed, as he passes the date of the Restoration, "the work of reconstructing the Presbyterian Church in the Highlands was onerous and pathetic," and tells that only six of the eighteen deprived and "outed" ministers of Argyll survived. But while the term reconstruction might possibly be fairly applied to the process in Southern Argyll Mr. Mackay himself on the next page writes, "Of the Western Isles it may safely be said that it was not till the Revolution Settlement that Presbyterianism began to be understood and accepted by their inhabitants." Episcopalian ministers held on, simply ignoring Presbyterian courts, sometimes with the active support of the people. In the North in Caithness, Suther-

land, Ross and Moray, episcopacy was dominant, and the Presbyterian Church found a hostile population. One classic source for the period that followed is Sage's famous *Memorabilia Domestica*. Episcopalian lairds moved their tenantry to oppose the settlement of "Whig ministers" as they called Presbyterians. Mr. Sage's grandfather Aeneas was a fiery giant from Easter Ross who was settled in 1724 as minister of Lochcarron. His first act on his arrival was to capture a native who had set on fire the hovel assigned to him as a manse. The Presbytery had not dared, because of a hostile mob, to meet within its own bounds. His parishioners showed the nature of their welcome by starting Sunday games at the church door at the hour of service. After seven years of labour there he petitioned, but in vain, for a change of sphere, saying that he went in danger of his life. One of his exploits was to master and bind in his own house a parishioner who objected to his purpose of catechising the household. This household included the man's mistress; the ministerial visit and the triumphant accomplishment of the catechising so impressed him that he shortly afterwards regularised his connexion with her by marriage.

Of the inhabitants of Lochcarron Mr. Sage says that they were Episcopalian in name but heathen in reality; and the same statement is made of the people of Reay, where a Mr. Pope was settled in 1734. This minister, too, was a man of gigantic strength as well as fervent piety and zeal He had a constable's authority and carried and used an official cudgel called the "baillie." He would visit in disguise as a pedlar, and having thus gained an entry would then by main force compel the family to family worship. He chose his elders for muscle as well as character, and it is recorded that three were once sent to fetch to the kirk a recalcitrant offender. The man was tied up in the front

pew for the duration of the service, and then duly admonished from the pulpit. Mr. Sage's great-grandfather, John Mackay of Lairg, inducted there in 1714, was also given power by the sheriff to inflict corporal punishment.

While the Church was slowly securing its position in these outlying parts another organisation came to its aid, the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Its first school was opened in 1710, but not till twenty or thirty years later did schools become at all common in the North and North-west. The Royal bounty of £1,000 annually was administered by the General Assembly after 1725, and devoted to the support of catechists and schools in the outlying districts. These schoolmasters and catechists exercised a deep religious influence in the Highlands.

These glimpses of church and manse life in the Highlands only a hundred and fifty years ago reveal that there the work of the Church, down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, was truly a missionary enterprise. Not all the ministers, indeed, looked on it in this light. Many were related to the landed families; their stipends, meagre enough, gave them a position of security; the free sporting life had its attractions. But men like Mr. Lachlan Mackenzie of Lochcarron and Mr. Fraser of Alness left a memory of the most fervent zeal and diligence in the work of the ministry and gradually brought into these remote glens, from their homes in Easter Ross it might be, or their residence as students in Aberdeen, those habits of strictest piety that came to be regarded as specially characteristic of the Highlander.

The result of steady pressure by Government and General Assembly was the establishment of Presbyterianism and the settlement of ministers over the North and West. In the sneer "whig ministers" there was truth; the movement was political and ecclesiastical as well as religious. There

is general agreement that except in the district between Inverness and Dornoch, which enjoyed the evangelical ministries described in Kennedy's *Days of the Fathers in Ross-shire* the prevailing type of minister belonged to the less worthy section of the "moderates." Here and there, however, "evangelicals" were found, and, as years passed, in increasing number. The people responded in a remarkable way to the new note in their preaching. To hear such ministers they flocked from neighbouring parishes. They returned home sensible of the contrast between them and their own pastors. The more earnest and gifted were quickly and naturally led to make an effort to meet the need that was felt; and, because it was not possible for a minister, sympathetic though he might be with the people, to invade a fellow-presbyter's parish, meetings for prayer and fellowship conducted by laymen sprang up and laymen were thrust into prominence. It is in these conditions, with a ministry divided by the cleavage between "moderate" and "evangelical," that the "Men" originated sporadically in district after district during the eighteenth century.

If a date and an explanation is thus found for the origin of the "Men," it has to be added that one great and special influence was brought to bear on the Highland mind in this period. In a recent report of the Bible Society Dr. Donald Fraser is quoted to the effect that the stability of a religious movement demands that the written Word should be in the hands of the people. Now in the Gaelic-speaking Highlands the written Word which came into the people's hands was not the Bible but the Shorter Catechism. It is in this fact that the distinctive formative factor in Highland religion is found. Among divines of every school at that date the duty of catechising is regarded as a chief part of a faithful minister's work. The Rev. Robert Kirke, episcopalian minister of Aberfoyle, author of the *Secret Com-*

*monwealth*, tells that he was diligent in catechising. The congregationalist Haldanes deplored its neglect. We may assume that wherever an evangelical minister was settled, one of his first activities was to introduce his parishioners to the Shorter Catechism, and see that they learnt it. Mackay of Lairg in 1714 is said to have catechised all the families in his huge parish, being absent from home as long as three months on this round of visitation. The traditions of godly ministers in the North all mention this catechising energy. It can easily be understood that, armed with this dialectic and filled with a sense of its depth and truth, simple laymen were prepared to test any minister's adequacy and soundness, and, if necessary, declare his errors and omissions, and lead those who would listen into a deeper grasp of the fundamentals of religion.

The emphasis on the catechism is made strikingly clear by the facts regarding the circulation of the book. What was the literature provided for Gaelic-speaking Scotland? The answer is sufficiently startling, yet the weight due to this information has perhaps not been recognised. Apart from the Psalms, no Gaelic scripture appeared before the New Testament of 1767, of which 10,000 copies were printed, the next edition being in 1796. The first Bible came out in 1782 at 16*s*. and not till 1807 was the next published at the more popular price of 3*s*. The year 1800 saw the first catechism with the scripture proofs appended. But for generations previously the Shorter Catechism had been a common Gaelic book. In 1659, that is a hundred and eighteen years before the publication of the New Testament, the Synod of Argyll published the Shorter Catechism and Psalms in Gaelic. In 1725 it was in its eighth edition, edition after edition having been printed since the beginning of the eighteenth century both in Glasgow and in Edinburgh, and usually at the price of one penny. In that year the

Synod added to it the Westminster Confession and the Larger Catechism. From this time onwards a steady stream of Shorter Catechisms poured into the Highlands, fourteen, if not twenty-one editions, up to the appearing of the New Testament, and about as many more before the first cheap Bible. The particulars of these editions are given in Reid's *Bibliotheca Scoto-Celtica.*

The inevitable conclusion is that an eager demand existed for these little books. Practically nothing else was printed in Gaelic for a hundred years. Here was the written word of truth. With its native genius for religion and metaphysic the Gaelic mind welcomed the clear and powerful logic of the catechism and its definite evangelical and Calvinistic formulation of Christianity, so that a whole population nourished their minds and whetted their intellects by its continual use, and became expert theologians along its lines.

In proof of this many an anecdote is to be found. Mr. Kennedy of Killearnanin, 1841, almost at the end of his ministry, visited an aged couple who lay dying. He asked them individually, "Do you believe that your affliction was appointed by God in the everlasting covenant?" The wife replied, "I believe that it is permitted by God in His providence, but I have not attained to believe that it was ordered in the covenant. The husband said he could not say even that. "You are a step behind her, Donald," said the minister, "and she will be before you in heaven." And so it fell out.

One of the "Men," Andrew Rugg of Keiss is said by Auld, in *Ministers and Men of the Far North*, to have discoursed thus on the parable of the Friend at Midnight: "What were the three loaves the man got from his friend? The electing love of his Father, the redeeming love of the Son, the sanctifying love of the Holy Spirit."

A quite recent story is of a Free Church minister who

was pressed to add a short service in English for the benefit of visitors to the district. He gave out as text, "The very hairs of your head are all numbered," and then discoursed at length, first, on the foreknowledge of God; second, on predestination in general; thirdly, on predestination in particular instances; and in conclusion added a very few sentences on the loving care of God.

Prof. John Macleod gives an account of meetings formerly held for catechising on Sundays on Locheilside. After praise and prayer and reading, he says, a question was asked and answered, and then question and answer were explained. "Thus though there was no preaching but the exposition of the Shorter Catechism, the people came to be instructed in the truths of God's Word."

Is it not clear that here a religion was found which used the Scriptures to illustrate the Catechism rather than the Catechism to explain the Scriptures? And is this surprising in view of the fact that one was circulated in print about a century before the other?

In this connexion it would seem that all that is austere and introspective in that compendium was congenial to the native genius of the Celt. Consistent evidence exists over a long period of a gloomy tendency in the Highland religious temper. Prof. Macewen describes Queen Margaret, about 1070 A.D., arguing with her Celtic subjects who refused to communicate for fear that they should "eat and drink judgment to themselves," and remarks that "this religious awe has survived the changes of eight centuries." Every minister who has worked in the North knows this deeply rooted sentiment. The writer remembers an appeal of his own addressed to a devout man thirty-five years of age being countered by the recollection of a warning the man had heard in a sermon as a young boy. He was told in Inverness in 1905 by a friend there that he had

just passed an old fish-wife in the market, sitting with so downcast a face that he had stopped to ask her trouble. Her answer was this, "I was just thinking of eternity and an angry God." In the late Dr. Black's early days in that town he was much frowned upon by his colleagues for his way of preaching free salvation; "as if," so they caricatured his genial gospel appeal, "you could just pick it up like a penny." In the early years of the present century the last of the local "men" still survived at Carr-bridge, a worthy and dignified character, moving quietly about among the few Free Presbyterians of the neighbourhood. The writer well recalls a funeral service which he conducted. The deceased was a venerable and pious lady held in exceptionable esteem. The crowd that tightly packed both rooms of the cottage waited in silence for the worship to begin. Presently a low musical sound swelled and penetrated from the far end of the house. This was the opening moan of old Duncan Fraser's prayer. The prayer was long and the key-note was this sentence, often repeated with sighs and groans: "She was one that was ever crying, crying to the Lord." No single word of confidence was expressed or reference made to the assurance of faith or the consolation of believers.

Now put beside these tales the fact that among the first few books translated into Gaelic in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the first attempt was being made to supply a Gaelic literature, were Bunyan's *Death of Mr. Badman* and *Sighs from Hell.* A friend of the writers' noticed a copy of the latter in a house in Strathspey a year or two ago "thumbed" he said, "like the Gospel according to John." It is in the light of the temperament thus evidenced rather than as an indication of any theological conviction that one views such stories as are found below about some of the "men."

George Brotchie, who lived near Thurso, lay a-dying; a friend, catching the words that he faintly breathed, "Thanks be to God," added for him, "who giveth us the victory." "No," said the old man sharply, rousing himself; "go and beat that if you like on your own drum-head. I say, 'Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift.'"

Hector Maclean, of Skye, about 1800 A.D. was visited by a man under strong conviction of sin and desirous of religious help. All the answer he got was "Many a big fire went out." When a friend not un-naturally remonstrated with Hector for not taking a kindlier tone, the reply was, "If the Lord has begun to work in him there will be no fear of him."

Two of the "men" were stepping across the hill to a Friday service in Lochaber one hot July day. Juniper and bog-myrtle scented the air, and again and again one of them stopped to inhale the balmy breeze, and remark on its fragrance. At last his friend lost patience and thus rebuked him, "Ah, James, what a dreadfully earthly nose you've got!"

One Donald Mackay, in Sutherland, was greatly vexed at his daughter's new fashion of hair-dressing; and stealing into her room while she slept, he snipped off the most conspicuous curl. Shortly afterwards she took fever and was shaved. "Glory be to Thee," said Donald, lifting up his hands in prayer as he looked on the fair young head from which its glory had departed, "I only took a little, Thou hast taken the whole."

It would be unfair, however, not to notice also the gentle humour, much quicker and much more subtle than the Lowlander's, which is one of the chief features of the Highland mind. The Celt, while possessing feelings of religious awe, can at the same time let his humour play about sacred matters in a fashion that would strike some as profane.

It is delightful to find the Rev. Alex. Auld, in the introduction to the book referred to, dredging up from dim antiquity a joke that he says was handed down in Halkirk. A mason, building the church at Skinnet, in a sudden difficulty called on John the Baptist for aid. A neighbour behind a wall, overhearing his exclamation, began to personate the saint, and to cast up to the workman his sins, saying, "How can a man like you expect heavenly help?" "Ay, ay, John, that's just you," replied the mason, "it was that ill tongue of yours that cost you your head."

The sayings remembered of the "men" are often full of humour. Alexander Gair of Wick compared the kine that drew the ark of Jehovah up from the land of the Philistines, lowing for their calves as they went, to the disruption ministers who led the Church out of Moderatism and State-control, but lamented the loss of stipends and glebes. He also concocted a dialogue between Isaac and Ishmael, in which Ishmael claimed all the marks of the covenant, but was at last triumphantly confuted by the retort, "Yes, but I got my deliverance by sacrifice, you by a drink from your mother's bottle." John Mackay, a catechist in Skye, was asked by a talkative woman if he could throw light on the passage, "there was silence in heaven for about the space of half an hour." He said, "The light that I will give you is this, that if there were many like you there, there would not be silence long." John Clark of Cromarty once caused a commotion there by declaring that not a builder or a tailor in Cromarty would be saved. He afterwards let it be understood that he meant, not a builder who rejected the headstone of the corner, or a tailor who patched his own rags of righteousness. This is told appreciatively by Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall. Auld records of Gair that he once propounded the thesis that man was saved by works, privately intending the works of Christ,

and thus provoked another of the men to an all-night discussion on his supposed heresy. Such are specimens of the kind of stories that have been treasured and chuckled over in the religious circles of the far North for generations.

But, above all, the fervour and natural eloquence of the "Men" and their acceptability as speakers is abundantly proved. Many had memorised large portions of the Bible; and the fact that they had to translate it freely into Gaelic made it a pliable instrument in their hands, some of them taking and abusing a wide liberty in this matter. As orators they had always this advantage: the whole mind of the people, as far as they had a grasp of religion at all, was saturated with Calvinistic doctrine, so that the preacher could assume in a large proportion of his audience a dexterous acquaintance with the questions and answers of the Shorter Catechism.

To come more closely to the "Men" themselves, the impression forms itself that it is "difficult to see the wood for the trees," and that, indeed, it is doubtful if there is a wood at all. The "Men," each in his own district, were held in high honour. A mass of anecdote concerning them survives, edifying, touching, amusing, trivial, sometimes incredible. Their power derived largely from their oratory, as witnessed by many sententious and epigrammatic sayings, and on the recollection of these their fame seems mainly to rest. The puzzling thing is that in English so many of these treasured and admired sentences do not sound so very remarkable. One who has made a considerable study of the matter admits, "It is true about Celtic wit evaporating in English dress. I feel how wretchedly tame and insipid in English form are the sayings of the Rev. Robert Finlayson of the Lews which his hearers loved to rehearse." And he adds that his feeling about the memorable and piercing sayings of "Macgrath Mor" is that in English they are

scarcely worth putting down. Here is an example from a pamphlet published last year by Prof. Macleod; he records in Gaelic a mother's famous rebuke to her boy. "Since God did not make you a fool, do not make a fool of yourself." It is not very impressive. But neither are the English translations of Japanese poems which are said to have in the original a vivid and powerful charm.

The various districts afford somewhat varied testimony to the quality of the contribution made by the "men" to their religious life. It is in Easter Ross, as might be expected, that the earliest records are found regarding them. A document is quoted by the Rev. W Findlater in his memoir of his father and brother, setting forth the rules and objects of an association of "men" in Rossshire dated September, 1788. Opposition to the "thrusting in" of ministers, and self-correction are their aims, while all divisive tendencies are expressly disclaimed. In fine, if quaint, language they confess to "closet coldness" and "un-tender walk." These "men" were expert in making a running translation of the English Bible into Gaelic. They were accustomed to meet on two evenings of the week, on one for prayer, on one for fellowship. In spite of their disclaimer they were felt by the Moderate majority to be a reproach and menace to the Established Church, and resolutions against them were passed in Presbytery and Synod. Such tradition as exists to-day about them and the "Men" of the Inverness district is to the effect that they represented a true and fervent strain of religion.

The beginning of evangelical preaching in Skye was at the visit in 1802 of a catechist who had been trained in the Haldanes' school for preachers. He made a convert of Donald Munro, a blind fiddler and catechist, who is said to have possessed extraordinary mental powers, and to

have known the Bible almost by heart. He became an eager evangelist, and six of his converts became well-known catechists. By some of the clergy he was encouraged, by others opposed. He came into the service of the S.P.C.K. and was known throughout the whole island. A revival of religion took place in 1812–1814, and in the result a separation came about between the people and the "moderate" ministers. In 1830, John Morrison, one of Donald Munro's converts, was organising prayer meetings in Harris, attended in the open air by as many as two thousand people. Another famous "man" in Skye was an ex-soldier, Norman Macleod, a catechist of the Edinburgh Gaelic Society. The preaching of these and others produced revivals and a consequent separation there too of the people from the ordinances of the "Moderate" ministers, and prepared the way for the practically solid adhesion of the island to the Free Church in 1843. Later, many of the "men" were leaders in the opposition which wrecked the Union movement of 1872.

In Lewis the "men" are still flourishing, and there the religious atmosphere appears always to have been unusually happy. Several Gaelic teachers were settled there in the opening years of the nineteenth century, and they were quickly followed by several ministers of notable evangelical power. The result is described by Mr. Norman Macfarlane in these words, "Christianity, when it is first planted in virgin soil, produces an unusual crop of able and devout men. . . . The Lews was no exception. Evangelical Christianity changed the face of the island." According to Mr. Macfarlane, the "men" of Lewis were the direct fruit of a remarkable revival. A kindly warmth pervades the stories handed down about them; of the children's love for one; of the heroic attempt of another to put into his Gaelic sermon a sentence for two English visitors: "man lost

in Eden—Christ Good Shepherd—He Door—Door soon shutted"; of a backward man who refused at first to lead in prayer: "O minister," he cried, "be so good and kind as to pass me by to-day." "If you can pass by the goodness and kindness of God to-day I have nothing more to say," replied the minister; whereupon he rose and poured out fervent praise. Two were called David and Jonathan for their love to one another. One won great renown as an ecclesiastical lawyer by insisting on the production of written commissions at a Presbytery meeting, and by this piece of obstruction, delaying for some weeks the prosecution of a call to his beloved minister from whom the congregation were loth to part.

It was in the far North and in the parishes of Daviot, Moy and Duthil that the "men" flourished who brought ridicule upon the name, and some embarrassment to the Free Church. The *Annals of the Disruption* maintains that such "Men" were a small part of the whole body, and confines them to ten out of the two hundred parishes in the Highland area, and quotes the Rev. Eric Findlater of Lochearnhead as saying that any child could draw the distinction between the main body of the "men" and the small section who took divisive courses and were known in some places as "separatists" or "Stewartites." At the same time one can believe that the Free Church inclined to ignore or tolerate the peculiarities of such as were loyal supporters of their cause. What happened was that, generally speaking, the "men," having largely created the evangelical movement in the Church, fell naturally into line as leaders in the Disruption, and their influence made whole districts go almost solidly into the Free Church. But the ministry of the Free Church was whole-heartedly evangelical and Calvinistic; and with the disappearance of the old cleavage between "moderate" and "evangelical,"

and the new confidence in the clergy and popular satisfaction with their attitude which prevailed, ministers gradually resumed their place as the acknowledged guides of the people in ecclesiastical and religious affairs; and the "men," no longer requiring to take so prominent a part as teachers and critics, found their place in an ordinary way among the office-bearers and members of the Church. Those who held aloof and claimed a special function became conspicuous by their peculiarities and cultivated a spirit of extreme and narrow censoriousness, sometimes refusing ordinances altogether and setting up rival services. There is a vague tradition of a heresy started by them in Duthil which was thought to amount to Tri-theism, and in other places some indefinite charges of antinomianism were made, and of strange practices of exorcism.

In the writer's former parish of Duthil one of the elders still tells that in his boyhood a flourishing singing-class was visited by the "men" and suppressed on the ground that the Psalms were being sung in harmony and not in unison. The memory still lingers there of one of his predecessors in the Free Church, the Rev. Robert Logan, who was called to the charge by way of defiance to the "men" who held the people in thrall. The Friday meeting was being held at which such gems of sarcasm were uttered as these: "There is a thing called a finger-post, and it stands at the cross-roads and points the right way beautifully, but it cannot move a step itself. That is like a minister without grace." "There's a bird called a parrot, and it can learn to speak beautifully, but oh! it cannot understand a word it says. That is like a minister without grace." Mr. Logan, who was to conduct the worship on Sunday, boldly attended the Friday service, and to the amazed delight of the congregation, broke out on the censorious speakers and completely turned the tables on them. He

was immediately called with enthusiasm to fill the vacancy. The "men" never forgave him. One night he found the body of his pet dog cut in two and laid on a bridge he had to cross. Next Sunday he denounced the deed from the pulpit. "I am neither a prophet nor a son of a prophet," he said, "but the man who did this will be hunting over the heather after his own best-beloved." The outrage was commonly attributed to a man whose wife afterwards went into delirium after the birth of successive children, and again and again was sought for on the moor and led back to her house by her husband.

The evidence against the extreme section of the "men" in Disruption times is raked together in the pithy but spiteful articles by "Investigator," who turned out to be Dr. Phin, one of the leaders of the Church of Scotland Assembly; the articles are summarised and amplified and reviewed in the *Quarterly* for September, 1851. His main instances are taken from Thurso and Latheron. The *Quarterly* writer asserts that in Skye the head-gear was of various hues, culminating in pure white as a sign of the highest grade of sanctity. A letter to the *Inverness Courier* in 1851 flatly denies the existence of any such colour scheme, saying the allegation was a pure invention. An embarrassed Free Church apologist makes a quite unconvincing and surely uncandid attempt to explain the cloak and handkerchief as humble folks' ordinary protection from the weather. "Investigator," describes how at the Latheron communion, where the "men" were all-powerful, the tables were fenced by the denunciation of witches, pipers, young women with curls, persons who put two fingers into their neighbour's snuff-box and one into their own, and ministers with head-knowledge. He says that bitter invective was directed at a girl who, when rain came on, put up her umbrella, a "devil's screen," and tells of a sustained attempt of the

"men" to prosecute a minister for heresy who had spoken of the temporary sufferings of Christ, on the ground that the only possible meaning of the word "temporary" was "trifling." He asserts that the Friday of communion week, "the day of the men," far overshadowed in popular estimation the day of the communion itself. He refers to the persecution many ministers endured, one having one day to listen while one of the "men" led his congregation in prayer for enlightenment as to what special sin or failing had brought on them the judgment of having him for their minister. As Dr. Phin is using the "men" as a stick to beat the Free Church with he is at pains to emphasise the large part they played in the Disruption. He also makes vague assertions of immorality and drunkenness about some of them.

It is quite evident that this attack caused some embarrassment to the Free Church. Such stories, comical as a whole rather than scandalous, yet discreditable to Highland manners and piety, could not altogether be denied. What could be done was to protest against the unfair impression of the "men" as a whole, that such critics sought to create. The writer in the *Inverness Courier*, for example, admits that two of the "men" gave way morally, but, he adds, with the immediate result that they were wholly discredited, and utterly lost caste and influence. Hugh Miller testified warmly to his admiration of the main body of the "men"; so did Prof. Blackie, an independent investigator. The controversy was, however, an unhappy one, and in it truth was hardly the aim. The assailants were animated by bitter dislike of the Free Church. The defenders, seeing that the Highlands were the glory of that Church, felt it impossible to make any admissions without giving dire offence to the faithful.

The later history of the "men" is easily understood.

Down to the present time they have often been leading opponents of hymns, organs, higher criticism, and union movements. While the rest of Scotland, under the influence of modern scholarship, was finding in the Scriptures renewed sources of devotional, historical and evangelical thought, the mind of the Gaelic-speaking districts was still engrossed in questions of election and predestination, and was profoundly distrustful of any religious idea not set forth in the ancient Catechism. The "men" naturally tended to take the side of conservative orthodoxy, and the "Highland host" became in the Free Church Assembly, to the admiration of a Lowland minority, the decisive re-inforcement for the upholding of reactionary views. The new knowledge has of course more and more prevailed; and the fact that its channel in reaching the remoter parts of the land has been the educated ministry is another reason for the diminished prominence of the "men" in recent times.

To sum up, it seems to emerge from this study that the "men" were products and representatives of the religion of their times and districts rather than a party in the Church. They broke no new ground in theology, made no innovations in order or worship, and except in one or two cases led no movement away from the Church. Each in his own neighbourhood was revered. What they had in common was a gift of fervent oratory, high character, and a true grasp of experimental religion.

R. W. Stewart.

## *WHAT IS NOW MEANT BY THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE?* [1]

THE outstanding feature of life to-day is its masterlessness. And this is true of practically every phase of it—commerce, industry, society, politics, art, science, philosophy, morals, religion. We have loosed from the old moorings, but for the ordinary mariner the charts of the great sea have been lost or destroyed. We are bewildered and can take no bearings. We are suffering from loss of authority.

The anarchy, the revolutionary spirit which is abroad, has a praiseworthy element at the root of it. It is a passion for life, and the freedom which is life's crown and joy. But freedom is not the end of life. The end of life is the Purpose and Will of God. There only is true freedom found. The passion for life can only be satisfied in the Lord and Giver of Life. This is Life's supreme Authority by which all other authorities are finally determined.

The question of the supreme religious authority is, of course, a wider one than that of the authority of Scripture. But the two are intimately bound up with each other. For the main problem about the abiding source of authority in religion to-day is precisely as to its point of impact upon human life. And the question of Scriptural authority is an integral part of that problem. How may the voice of God reach again the heart and conscience of mankind? In face of the undermining of all other forms of authority, must we be content with affirming the autonomy of the conscience? "Stern daughter of the voice of God," sang Wordsworth of Duty:

[1] A paper read before the Christian Unity Association, whose president is the Primus of Scotland.

"Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
And the most ancient heavens through thee are fresh and strong."

But the trouble is that we cannot say "the Kingdom of Humanity, through thee, is fresh and strong." Bishop Butler said of the conscience: "Had it might as it has right it would absolutely govern the world." But civilisation is broken; human society is bankrupt. We are more conscious than ever to-day of lack of purity and lack of power. If God had left conscience to fight its battle alone, this would be of all worlds the most miserable. But the Scripture Records declare that the Divine voice *has* uttered itself in human history. The authority of these records is therefore a question of fundamental importance in determining the nature of the Divine impact upon the soul of man.

(1) A few historical notes may help to remind us of the nature and ramifications of the question at issue.

In nearly every period of the Church's history it has been maintained with more or less persistency that Christianity is a religion of the Spirit, not a book religion. Christianity lived, and the Fellowship of the faith expanded rapidly, for almost a generation without the aid of any specifically Christian document; and for three centuries, more or less, without a universally recognised canon of Christian Scripture. Nevertheless, owing to the frailty of human nature, the attempt of the Fellowship to live the life of the Spirit without leaning on extraneous authority has always been found as difficult as trying to maintain an unstable equilibrium. And the tendency to repose in external authority has oscillated between Apostolic tradition as embodied in ecclesiastical organisation on the one hand, and Apostolic authority as embodied in documents on the other. The passing of the first generation of Christ's followers and the growth of heresy led to the recognition of both these organs

of authority. Indeed the ability of the heretics to quote or invent Apostolic documents in their own support led men like Papias to go behind the documents to Apostolic tradition as the prior authority. And by and by the Church, as the heir of Apostolic tradition, constituted herself as the final arbiter not only of the limits of the canonical writings, but of their interpretation. Mediævalism crystallised this into a dogma. "*Ego uero euangelio non crederem,*" said St. Augustine, "*nisi me Catholicae ecclesiae commoueret auctoritas.*"

One of the main results of the Reformation was to shift the weight of authority, for Protestant Christianity, from the Church to the Bible, from an infallible Pope to an infallible book, which a Roman critic of the Reformation called "the paper Pope of the Protestants." Such a summing up of Church History is, however, only a cursory and superficial view of the situation. Far behind the Reformation lies another decisive moment in the history of this question. Recently Harnack, with a wealth of erudition, has gone far to establish the thesis that the most important figure between St. Paul and St. Augustine is Marcion. Before Marcion, there were Churches but no Church, documents but no New Testament. We owe both of these facts, not to Marcion indeed, but to the reaction against Marcion. Yet the appearance of Marcion is an epoch-making event in the life of Christianity.

Now it is not exactly true to say that before Marcion Christianity was a bookless religion. From the beginning, as the New Testament writings themselves witness, the Jewish Christian Fellowship regarded the Old Testament as a book of Divine authority. According to Dr. Rendel Harris's recent investigations, the earliest writings engaged in by Christians were compilations of Messianic Oracles from the Old Testament. And the impulse of the early

Church was right, if the method was faulty. It is partly in tracing the growth of the Messianic idea that the Old Testament is still valuable to us to-day. It was, however, concerning the Old Testament that the first serious assault was made on the authority of Scripture—and by Marcion. And it is noteworthy that it came, not along the line of Textual but of Ethical criticism. That the God of the Old Testament was not the God of the New, sounds a fantastic speculation to us to-day. The Faith, whose creed was, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one," had already in principle transcended that view. The monotheism of the prophets forms the starting-point for the New Testament revelation. But it is the failure of the Church to adjust its views against the strength of Marcion's attack that has made the ethical assault on the Old Testament assume such grave dimensions to-day.

The failure of the Church took, first, the direction of a hardening of the dogma of plenary inspiration. The Jewish-Christian Church not only adopted the Old Testament as Scripture, but adopted the attitude which the Jewish hierarchy maintained to their Scriptures as well. It cannot be too strongly asserted that the doctrine of plenary inspiration is a Jewish not an intrinsically Christian doctrine. It was fashioned in the inter-Testamental period, and was taken over by the Church from the Synagogue. When the Massorete wiped his pen, and took a fresh dip of ink every time he copied the sacred name, it is a witness to the superstition of the Jew concerning the explosive force for good or evil stored up in words. The very errors of earlier copyists were sacred to the Massoretes. Inspiration was regarded as uniform, mechanical and equal in every part. Every word and every letter had an absolutely binding force. And it was a deepening of disaster when the same doctrine came to be held concerning the New Testament writings.

Again, the determining of the limits of the Canon became a pressing problem after Marcion. The authority of the Canon is a somewhat different question from the authority of Scripture. It would not be quite fair to say the authority of Scripture is from God, the authority of the Canon from the Church. But the authority of Scripture speaks from within Scripture, direct to heart and conscience. The authority of the Canon is an ecclesiastical rule imposed from without. Yet the two things have this connexion: the latter is an attempt to decree by ecclesiastical fiat which writings do speak to us with the authentic voice of God. The challenge has often been made, whether any sort of spiritual authority can be acknowledged in a decision of Council, in which logic was helped out by clamour and even by fists, and a result reached by vote of the majority. Is this the way in which the guidance of the Holy Spirit operates? In fairness, three things must be set down by way of rejoinder. When one compares the documents of the New Testament with the patristic writings, and recognises the astonishing difference in the level of spiritual illumination; when one remembers also that in the nineteen centuries which have elapsed no great Christian writing has appeared which does not owe all its greatness to the New Testament, one is compelled to admit that the verdict of the Church was substantially right. Secondly, one has to remember that the limits of the Canon were virtually determined, long before any decree of Council, by the growing consensus of the Christian community. Thirdly, it will be freely acknowledged that no decree of Council could have voted a secular book or even a religious book of indifferent value, that had not the Apostolic imprimatur, to a place within the Canon. It must first authenticate itself as speaking from God to the heart and conscience of the Christian community. Even the Roman communion admits

that the soul with its inner testimony of the Spirit is the ultimate seat of authority. In the light of these considerations we do right to acknowledge the Church's guidance by the Holy Spirit in fixing the Canon of Scripture. The Church's failure here lay in not adding the necessary proviso. It is the Church of the saints, not the Church of the hierarchy that has spiritual authority. The true Apostolic succession is the succession of the faithful. And the heart and conscience of the living Church of believers must still hold themselves free to make their own Spirit-guided judgments as to the nature and degree of the authority of Scripture within the Canon.

But the Church of the hierarchy took a further false step in the centuries succeeding the age of Marcion. It arrogated to itself the function of arbiter of dogma. It was soon found that it was not sufficient to define the Canon as the sole source for Christian truth. The heterodox became just as nimble at discovering his own doctrine in Scripture as the orthodox. There was a deal of bandying of texts at Nicea. But the determining of dogma by the Church became a tyranny. Every great renewal of the Church's life was partly of the nature of a revolt against this tyranny. The Reformation was such. And it was not, in the first instance, the exchange of one set of dogmata for another. It was a rediscovery of the fontal religious experience which lies behind all dogma. Yet when the first wave of spiritual quickening passed, the old struggle over dogma began again ; until the squib of Werenfels of Basel became true ;

> "Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
> Inuenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua."

The attempt to buttress the authority of Scripture by the authority of the Church led to a displacing of the one by the other to the detriment of both. And long before the

Reformation the first whispers of a new assault on the infallibility of Scripture were beginning to be audible. The discovery of endless variants gradually undermined the theory of plenary textual inspiration. From the days of Pope Damasus and St. Jerome the Church has felt the need of meeting that difficulty. An attempt was made to establish the true text, or a text which should be universally received as such, not merely by the Roman Church but by the Reformed Church as well. A note in the Preface of one of the Elzevir editions of the New Testament—"*Textum nunc habes ab omnibus receptum*"—had almost more influence in determining the text for the Church of the Reformation than the decree of the Council of Trent had in establishing a corrupt version of the Vulgate for Rome. It was said of the Council of Trent that the Spirit came from Rome in fetters. But a boastful note in an editor's preface can scarcely be said to have a better claim to be the voice of the Spirit. And neither decree nor preface stayed the researches of scholars. Which among the 150,000 variant readings were the true ones of this infallible book? Such was the next big assault upon the authority of Scripture, or at least upon the theory of plenary textual inspiration.

A few sentences will suffice to describe the present-day many-sided assault upon the authority of Scripture—the result of scientific research both in things secular and in things sacred. Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Kepler removed—for human thought—the earth from the centre of the universe; Darwin turned the creation story into myth and poetry; the literary and historical critics have called in question the authenticity, accuracy and integrity of the Scripture documents. The results of their labours have broken out like a flood from the narrow cloisters of scholarship and poured along the ordinary ways of human inter-

course. And the fetish of an infallible book, inspired in every word, lies in hopeless ruins.

The old symbols of the hand beckoning out of heaven, the heavenly book that is eaten and then retold by the recorder's pen, the dove whispering in the ear, the Divine ray shining on the head of the evangelist whose hand extends in benediction over his amanuensis (as in the quaint old etching of St. John and Prochorus)—these have to be set aside. Even the figures of the human lyre played upon by the fingers of God, of the flute breathed through by the Holy Spirit, of men as the hands and pens of the Holy Ghost, who is sole author—these too have to be abandoned. The idea of Divine guidance, *in actu scribendi*, of a mere passive, Divinely hypnotised medium is untenable. It is men with all their human faculties active, all their idiosyncrasies in full play, men beset by all their earthly frailties and limitations, that are inspired—not written words. They are inspired to teach neither science, philosophy, nor history, but to record the authentic drawing near of God to men in history. And it is as such the writings still make their appeal to us. The writers are men lifted up to share in a great religious experience as they react to the intervention of God in human history. And it is to *our* spiritual faculties, our religious instinct, our faith, our religious experience they make their appeal. "Nothing is ours, however it be presented to us," says Principal Oman, "except we discover its truth, and except it prove itself again in our experience."

(2) How then shall we begin again to reconstruct our view of the authority of Scripture? And what should the nature of that authority be?

Two principles—sanctioned in Reformation theology—form our starting-point: the principle that the Word of God is not the letter of Scripture but is contained in Scrip-

ture; and the correlated principle that the judge of what constitutes the Word of God in Scripture is the *Testimonium internum Spiritus sancti.* But the Word of God and the inner testimony of the Spirit are in themselves abstractions. We must find some concrete unifying point of view from which we may formulate a doctrine of the authority of Scripture. Otherwise the inward witness of the Spirit may easily become for us the soul's natural light that lighteth every man coming into the world, which may be anything from the Socratic *daimonion*, or the Inner Light of Quakerism, to the conscience. And the Word of God may come to be sought for in dim, vague insights, not merely in the Bible, but also in nature and the science of nature, in the sacred writings of other faiths, and in the classic literature of all the world. Doubtless some "word of God" is to be found there. God writes upon the veil that hides His face; God writes His law upon the heart of Pagans, "their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another": He "hath nowhere left Himself without a witness." But for Christian faith, these do not constitute *the* Word of God, nor is it *before* the Word, but *by* and *with* the Word that the Holy Spirit witnesses in our hearts.

In what way, then, may we link the Word with the inner Witness so as to avoid these errors? To put the matter briefly in three defining sentences: *Scripture*, for the Christian believer, is the record of one central and supreme, Divine revelatory process and its consummation in human history. And the authoritative *Word* of God in Scripture is the Gospel of the choosing, saving, and redeeming God in action which culminates in the Cross of Christ. And the inner *Witness* of the Spirit is simply the believer's experience of the impact of this Gospel on his soul. It is there, in "the word of the Cross," as it meets with and apprehends

our Spirits that the authority of Scripture lies for us, because *there* is the Divine act that utters and reveals the supreme purpose of the Divine Will.

There is nothing prior to this experience for the Christian. For the Church is the creation of the Gospel and of the experience which flows from the Gospel; the Book is the expression of the experience. Nor is the experience merely subjective. The seat of authority is in experience: the source and the throne of it is in God. That which we call faith in us is in essence the same thing in the sacred writers, only raised to the level of inspiration. What, in our case, is the being apprehended by God in the Cross of Christ is, in the case of the sacred writers, the being commissioned by God to convey the Gospel revelation. The Word and the inner witness are, we might say, the objective and the subjective aspects of the one supreme fact of Experience.

That condensed statement may be illustrated and expanded in this way. When Mr. H. G. Wells essays to fashion a new Bible for us by constructing a thesaurion or anthology from the books of the greater religions and the world's classics, he has missed the essential significance of what it is that constitutes a Bible. The result of his labours might indeed be a record of man's spiritual development, but it would not be a record of God's taking action in history for one supreme redemptive end. It is God active to this end in history that is the soul's only religious authority. And it is the record of this redemption activity that constitutes our sole Bible.

Nor is it any contradiction of this when we say that the one sole authority to which the soul can bow uttering its consenting "Amen" is the inner testimony of the Spirit. For the Christ on His Cross is the ultimate and supreme gateway through which the Spirit now comes to man in the experience of redemption. The seat of authority, we

have said, is the soul, but the source is God. And the channel from the source to this inner well which springs up into everlasting life is the Gospel. The experience is God, stooping down to reach man, met by man reaching up to God, in the Gospel. Not man in his solitude, be it said, lest we be thought to minimise the place of the Church in this experience, but the believer within the Fellowship of Faith, a member of the Mystical Body, the Church Catholic. For the witness which is valid from age to age goes back to the Person of Christ, and to Christ on His Cross, "not through the void but through the peace and joy and holiness He has wrought in the souls of men." And the unique and fontal expression of that experience is and must ever remain the Scriptures. "Authority," says Principal Forsyth, "speaks in experience, especially the corporate experience of the Church, and the classic expression of that experience is in the canonical documents of our faith."

(3) How does the view here indicated apply to the different phases of "the classic expression of that experience"?

It is no inversion of the true order but in the nature of things, that we begin with the New Testament, and with the Gospels in the New Testament. The Gospels are for us the records of the redeeming Passion of our Lord. They are born out of the Christian experience, which still lives in the Church, in the bosom of which we receive them. Love still finds its Galilee in the Gospels, and faith its Calvary and Olivet. When the Passion of our Lord speaks home to us in the experience of faith, we find ourselves on a rock remote from the sapping tides of critical science. For the Gospels are testimonies to Christ borne by the first believers, and only in a secondary sense histories about Christ. When Christ is thus held up to us, the voice of God becomes not only audible but significant and com-

pelling in Him. And "it is by no means necessary that we should know everything that is in the Gospels to be true, or that we should be bound to the accuracy of every detail, before they begin to do for us what God designs them to do. . . . It is to Christ we give our trust, and as long as the Gospels make us sure of what He is, they serve God's purpose and our need" (Denney). Nay, if we accept the dictates of the Spirit we must be prepared to go all the length with truth. No truth can be alien to The Truth, into the freedom of which we have been promised guidance.

If the Gospels have authority as the record of the Passion of Christ, what of the Epistles? Are they not simply the expressed opinions of other believers—among the first generation, it is true, but still just believers on the same level of faith as our own? Is the important thing, as Herrmann affirms, not that we should have the thoughts of the Apostles about Christ, but that we should have our own? Surely the important thing is that we should have *God's* thoughts about Christ. And does it not stand to reason that if God's action in history consummated itself as fact and life in Jesus Christ, God must add another chapter to His book of revelation, to disclose the full meaning of that fact and that life; and that chapter must follow immediately upon the appearance of the fact, if His revelation is not to be lost to the world? Once more God's Word in the Apostolic testimony witnessing with the inner testimony of the Spirit convinces us that these Apostolic witnesses are the Divinely appointed human mirrors in which the great redemption-fact is, not only reflected, but made to yield up its inner secrets for the sake of a perishing world. The Gospels manifest God's Deed in history: the Epistles are its inspired interpretation. They are not a light shed on the fact from outside; they are a liberating

of the radiance which belongs to the fact. They are the ever-living fact speaking in its God-appointed, final, and normative expression. Gospel and Epistles together form the record of the one supreme religious fact, which is the Lord, the Spirit. Speaking in the Apostles, the Spirit is the expositor and translator of what the Lord has done. The Apostles were uniquely and Divinely commissioned for the task; they are the human intermediaries of God's mind expressed once in the fact, and again in the glory that breaks from the fact. The act is inseparable from its own account of itself, through men raised up for the purpose. No doubt they had to express it in the language of the thought-moulds of the age. But the Spirit speaking in the Word and in the heart of the believer is Itself Its own judge to separate form from content. (Forsyth: *Principle of Authority.*)

What is the significance of the Old Testament in this point of view? Suppose our Lord Jesus, and the Christian Experience, and the New Testament had never come into existence: would the Scriptures of the Old Testament have become documents of Divine authority for so great a portion of mankind? We venture to suggest they would have remained little more than the Scriptures of the Jews. On the other hand suppose the Old Testament, and the history, the experience behind the Old Testament had never been: would the New Testament revelation have made anything like its full and far-flung impact upon the world? Would it indeed have been possible for the New Testament revelation to begin just where it did? Without the mountain-mass of Old Testament monotheism could the stainless peak of New Testament revelation have risen up into the full blaze of God's sunlight? Only by a violation of God's law of progressive revelation. And because of the limitations of human nature it would have failed·

We would have been unprepared for it. The inspiration of the New Testament forms an organic unity with the Old. The authority of the Old Testament for the Christian is dependent on the Divine authority of the Gospel. The Old Testament Scriptures are the record of an integral and preparatory part of the Divine Action in History—the record of the gradual and progressive disclosure of the mind and will of God for man. Under the old mechanical view of verbal inspiration the Old Testament is full of stumbling-blocks for the morally awakened and Christ-enlightened mind. It is this principle of the progressiveness of revelation that clears away the difficulty. And surely the time has come for us to teach it publicly, if not in season and out of season, at least on all timely and appropriate occasions.

In saying so we are not claiming the right of private judgment to pronounce criticism on the morals of the older dispensation. We measure the relative dimness or brightness of the Old Testament insights by the full flood of the Gospel theophany. Above all, in the handling of the Old Testament Scriptures the example of our Lord must ever hold the place of supreme authority for the Christian. The loss of authority within the Church to-day is in part a nemesis for our misunderstanding and misinterpretation of His reverence for the sacred books of Israel, and for our failure to follow Him in His fearless freedom. If we examine His references to the Old Testament with a view to determining His principle of selection, we find that His criticism of the details of the Mosaic Law was ever in the light of the highest that the Law itself contained. Again, about practically every one of the incidents of Old Testament history He refers to, the remarkable feature is that they represent some veritable drawing near of God to man. And His favourite Psalms, the prophetic words He chooses,

are those that have this also for their burden, or those that shine with the brightest light of heaven. The heart of all the Law, for Him, is Love to God and man. The heart of History is the drawing near of God to man. The heart of prophecy is the mercy of God to man, and the Divine Law of Suffering Service. It belongs to the uniqueness of Christ that it was He who identified the Messiah of expectation with God's suffering Servant of prophecy, and found that supreme purpose of God for man's redemption being realised in Himself. It is there surely, there above all else that the focal point of the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures lies for us to-day.

JAMES ALEX. ROBERTSON.

## *THE WATER LIBATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

THE Old Testament data for the study of the water libation is exceedingly meagre. There is no allusion to the rite in any of the ritual sections of the Hexateuch, but elsewhere two passages occur in which the pouring out of the water before the Deity is mentioned in such a casual fashion as to lead the reader to infer that the water libation was common enough, in the official pre-prophetic religion of Israel, as well as in the popular cult. In addition to these explicit references, hints of the rite lie buried in some of the poetic passages in which water is used as a *tertium comparationis*. The origin and suggestiveness of these similes and metaphors are most probably due to the original symbolical significance of the water libation as it was offered to Yahweh. The purpose of this paper is to study the limited Old Testament material in the light of Comparative Religion, in order to learn the genesis and significance of a rite which has almost vanished from the pages of the Hebrew Bible.

An examination of the Old Testament material leads to the discovery that there are only two passages in which the pouring of water as a libation is explicitly mentioned. The more familiar mention of the rite is in connexion with the well-known incident of the pouring of the water which David's three heroes had brought from the well at Bethlehem.[1] In devotion to their beloved leader they had risked their lives in breaking through the Philistine lines. Consequently David refused to drink the water which he had craved, and instead of using it to quench his thirst he "poured it out unto Yahweh."[2] In this instance there can be no question that a libation is meant, for the technical Hebrew term for a liquid offering is employed. The original of the phrase quoted in the preceding sentence is וַיִּסֵּךְ אֹתָם לַיהוָה. The word וַיִּסֵּךְ points unmistakably to a libation, and is so interpreted in the literal rendering of the Septuagint, *καὶ ἔσπεισεν αὐτὸ τῷ κυρίῳ*. David felt that the water from the well at Bethlehem could not be treated as ordinary water because it was the equivalent of blood. It had acquired this quality in consequence of the risk which his three warriors had run in securing it. Libations of blood were a recognised feature of the Priestly Code, and in the Greek and Roman periods of Jewish history wine was frequently treated as a substitute for the blood of the animal sacrifice. Combining this evidence with the facts preserved in 2 Samuel, and especially noting the casual way in which the technical Hebrew term for libation is used in describing the act of David, we have at least a strong suggestion that water might be used as a surrogate for blood.[3]

A second allusion to the rite of offering water to the Deity

[1] 2 Sam. xxiii. 14. [2] 2 Sam. xxiii. 16.

[3] In the description of the ministrations of the high priest Simon, the son of Onias, we find the suggestive lines :

"He stretched out his hand to the cup of libation
And poured of the blood of the grape." (Ecclesiasticus lix. 15.)

is found in connexion with an event which happened shortly before the incident in David's life, discussed in the preceding paragraph. In a time of national disaster, after the Philistines had crushingly defeated Israel, Samuel as prophet and judge summons a national assembly at Mizpah to pray for deliverance from their enemies. Under the direction of this prophet, the narrative informs us, the people " drew water, and poured it out before Yahweh and fasted on that day, and said there, We have sinned against Yahweh." [4]

It can scarcely be questioned that the pouring of water is used on this occasion at Mizpah to symbolise contrition Both the general context and the association of the water-pouring with fasting suggest that the liquid symbolised penitence for national sins. The casual fashion in which the rite is brought into the narrative points to it as a well-known institution, needing no explanation ; its employment by Samuel, the recognised prophet of Yahweh, indicates that it had become officially incorporated in the official religion of Israel in that age. We feel that Professor S. R. Driver laid too much stress on a philological argument when he denied any reference in this passage to a libation.[5] In his typically cautious manner the distinguished English Hebraist interprets the pouring out of the water " probably as a symbolic act implying complete separation from sin : sin was to be cast away completely as water poured out upon the earth." A careful study of Professor Driver's comment on this verse brings out the fact that he bases his conclusion entirely on the etymology of the word וַיִּשְׁפְּכוּ. He maintains that the writer would have employed וַיִּסְּכוּ, the *terminus technicus* for the presentation of liquid sacrifices,

[4] 1 Sam. vii. 6 : some writers consider Elijah's pouring water on the altar an analogue, others an instance of mimetic magic. (1 Kings xviii. 35.)

[5] Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, ad loc.*

instead of וַיִּשְׁפְּכוּ, had he intended the reader to understand him to be describing a libation. We freely grant that this argument is philologically unimpeachable, if we limit our consideration to the etymology and usage of these two Hebrew words. But the addition of the phrase " before Yahweh " unmistakably points to an act of worship. If we were to read that the people " poured out " blood or wine or oil or milk " before Yahweh " in connexion with fasting, we would naturally regard the act as a libation, although the Hebrew verb employed happened to be שָׁפַךְ rather than the *terminus technicus* נָסַךְ. Furthermore, philology, pure and simple, is not sufficient to determine the interpretation of such an isolated allusion as we have in 1 Samuel vii. 6, but its meaning must be determined in the light of Comparative Religion, to which science we now turn for assistance in elucidating this passage.

Before passing to the consideration of the material furnished by other religions, let us note that, whatever difference of opinion prevails as to the interpretation of particular words or the underlying reason for the symbolism of water, there is a general agreement among interpreters of all schools as to the significance of the transaction which is described in 1 Samuel vii. The ancient Jewish interpretation embodied in the Targum of Jonathan caught the spirit of the passage in its paraphrase " and their hearts were poured out in penitence like water before Yahweh." Most of the subsequent commentators have followed the Targum without making any attempt to discover the reason for the employment of water. Hugo Grotius, before the days of Oriental study, imagined that the water signified the tears of penitence (quoted in Lange *ad loc.*) ; and, as already mentioned, Professor Driver thinks that the pouring out of water implies complete separation from sin. But none of the great Old Testament interpreters, however,

have essayed to explain the selection of water, rather than some other liquid like oil or wine, as a symbol of absolute separation from sin. Had it been customary for the Hebrews to use milk, the common libation of the Arabs, as a drink offering, and had Samuel employed it instead of water, it would have symbolised the separation of the people from their sins just as well as the water because the ground would have as readily absorbed the milk. It would have been cast away as completely as water. In other words, the pouring out of any liquid as a libation might logically suggest absolute separation from sin. Hence such an explanation is too general and does not adequately account for the selection and use of water rather than some other liquid like oil, wine, or milk, because each of these was employed as a libation by the Semites.

To discover an adequate explanation for the use of water as a libation to symbolise penitence and contrition, it is necessary to turn to other religions and study the use of this common liquid as the material of sacrifice. Later Judaism is of little assistance to us in this investigation. Rabbinical scholars have frequently claimed that the water-pouring in connexion with the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in Herod's Temple was based upon this passage of 1 Samuel.[6] If the Rabbinical contention were true, the

[6] The water libation in connexion with the Feast of Tabernacles is described in the Tract Succah. The Gemara associates the custom with Isa. xii. 3. Ludwig Venetianer has attempted to prove that the Jewish ceremony of pouring water in the Second Temple was introduced under the influence of Hellenism in the Hellenistic period and was a counterpart of the feast of πλημοχοαί, which was celebrated on the sixth day of the great Eleusinian Mysteries (Ludwig Venetianer, *Die Eleusinischen Mysterien im jerusalemischen Tempel*, Frankfurt, 1897). Henri Hubert has subjected the theory of Venetianer to searching criticism, and has called attention to the analogues in the Old Testament to the water offering at the Feast of Tabernacles. His survey of the subject leads him to deny any connexion between the Temple rite and the Eleusinian Mysteries. Cf. *Revue des Études Juives*, xxxvi. p. 317 f.

later practice might throw some light on the original significance of the rite of water-pouring, but as a matter of fact the institution of Herod's Temple throws no light on the use of water in a libation as a symbol of contrition. The ceremonial of the taking of water from the brook Siloah, during the Feast of Tabernacles, and carrying it in a golden pitcher in solemn procession to the altar where it was poured into two ewers, is regarded by all scholars, both Jewish and Christian, as a survival of mimetic magic for the purpose of inducing rain. One of the commonest of magical rites, occurring the world over in primitive religion, is the pouring or sprinkling of water as a rain charm. There is a hint in a prophetical passage of the Greek period that the proper observance of the Feast of Tabernacles ensured rain. The oracle imbedded in Zechariah xiv. 16, 17 is of such interest in this connexion that we quote it in full :

"And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations that came against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, Yahweh of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.

"And it shall be, that whoso of all the families of the earth goeth not up unto Jerusalem to worship the King, Yahweh of hosts, *upon them there shall be no rain.*"

The threat of a drought for failure to observe the Feast of Tabernacles suggests that some of the ceremonies of this Feast had to do with the production of rain and might easily have consisted of acts of mimetic magic. Whatever these rites may have been in the age of this prophetical oracle and earlier, we have their lineal descendant in the ceremonial of water-pouring in Herod's Temple during the Feast of Tabernacles. In the latter case there is no doubt that we have an instance of mimetic magic which throws no light on our problem, because between water as used in mimetic magic and water as a libation expressing penitence there can be no genetic or logical connexion.

In the Assyro-Babylonian religion the water libation was an important rite. It was offered to the shades of the deceased, and a special order of priests, designated Water-pourers (na-aḳ mē), was intrusted with the proper performance of the ceremony. The happiness and welfare of the shades in the Underworld, or Aralu, demanded an ample supply of water as well as of food according to the Babylonian and Assyrian ideas. The many references to the water libation, through the historical inscriptions, and the particular connexions in which it is mentioned, are exceedingly suggestive of its importance and the frequency of its occurrence. It will be instructive to note a few of the allusions to this rite in the cuneiform literature. In a boundary-stone inscription of the VI. Babylonian Dynasty,[7] among a series of curses, a terrible imprecation is called down upon a man; in it the god Ninib is implored to destroy the man's son and thus deny him the water-offerer. Another curse runs, "May Bel destroy his seed, not may he have a water-offerer."[8] In a certificate of adoption[9] that has come down to us, one Ina-Urak-rishat by name adopts a certain Etirtu as a daughter. Among the various mutual obligations and duties which are enumerated in this certificate, one of those undertaken by Etirtu, the adopted daughter, is the offering of the water libation on the death of Ina-Urak-rishat. Again, Asshurbanipal, the mighty monarch, records his satisfaction at the fulfilment of his duties when he offers food and water to the shades of his predecessors on the throne. He calls attention to the fact

[7] Col. II, line 18, 19 of a boundary stone.

li-ḫal-liḳ apli u
na-aḳ mî ai u-šar-ši-šu.

*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, iv. pp. 86, 87.

[8] Bēl zērašu lilqutma (amel) na-aḳ me.
Rawlinson, iv. 12 R, 33.

[9] Transliteration and translation are to be found in Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 393.

that the rite had fallen into neglect and that he regarded the omission of these offerings as a serious dereliction of an important duty.[10] Many other passages occur in the historical inscriptions in which the offering of a water libation to the shades of the deceased is mentioned, but it is not necessary to give any further quotations because enough material has been adduced to prove both the frequency and the importance of the rite. The consideration of its nature may be deferred until some important material outside the Semitic field has been examined.

The Greeks also practised an analogous rite and offered libations of water to Xthonic deities as well as to the shades of the deceased. Pausanias[11] mentions a festival that was held in the precincts of the Temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, where there was a cleft, a cubit in width. According to the legend as given by Pausanias, the waters of the deluge of Deucalion were drained from the surface of the earth through this cleft. During the festival, wheat cakes mixed with honey, termed "soul cakes," were cast into the cleft for the souls of those who had perished in this deluge. At the same time, the festival of *ὑδροφορία* (Festival of Water-bearing) was celebrated. The ceremonial of the *ὑδροφορία* consisted in maidens carrying water in jars and pouring it down this same cleft, in order to quench the thirst of the spirits of the victims of the flood. Lucian is the authority for the prevalence of a similar rite at Hierapolis on the Euphrates where the Semitic Astarte had become Hellenised under the name Hera. At Hierapolis, a cleft under the sanctuary was associated with the deluge of Deucalion, and twice a year water borne from the Euphrates was poured down this opening. For the purpose

[10] Vide *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii. [pp. 262, 263; also iv. pp. 206, 207.

[11] *Pausanias*, Bk. I, ch. xviii.

of this discussion it is not necessary to decide whether the rite practised at this point on the Euphrates was indigenous or transplanted from Hellas; it is sufficient to notice its occurrence and its close similarity to the ceremonial which was described by Pausanias.

The most detailed and interesting literary reference to the water libation is found in "The Persians" of Æschylus. In this instance it constitutes a part of the ceremonial of necromancy. According to Æschylus, Atossa, the widow of Darius Hystaspes, on hearing of the defeat of the Persians at Salamis, betakes herself to the tomb of her husband. The widowed queen offers up libations in order to call up her husband from Hades, to secure his comfort in the hour of bitterness and his advice for guidance in the day of national disaster. Among the ingredients of her libations the poet lists water, as well as milk, honey, wine, and oil :—

> "Once more I issue from my home, and bring
> To my son's royal sire, libations kind,
> Whate'er is soothing to the honoured dead.
> White milk, sweet draught from heifer undefiled:
> The flower-distillers dew, translucent honey,
> *And crystal water drawn from virgin spring;*
> Here joyance too I bring of ancient wine,
> Draught unadulterate from mother wild;
> From pale green olive-tree, that while it lives
> With constant leafage blooms, this odorous fruit;
> And wreathed flowers, brood of all-teeming Earth.
> But, O my friends, chant ye well-omened hymns
> *O'er these libations offered to the dead;*
> Darius' mighty ghost do ye invoke,
> While I, these honours, which the earth shall drink,
> Myself will send to deities below." [12]

[12] The poetical rendering is that of Anna Swanwick in Bohn's Classical Library. The lines of most significance for our discussion are also given in the original :—

613 λιβάσιν ὕδρηλαῖς παρθένον πηγῆς μέτα
619 ἀλλ', ὦ φίλοι, χοαῖσι ταῖσδε νερτέρων
620 ὕμνους ἐπευφημεῖτε, τὸν τε δαίμονα
621 Δαρεῖον ἀγκαλεῖσθε, γαπότους δ' ἐγὼ
622 τιμὰς ροπέμψω τάσδε νερτέροις θεοῖς.

The meaning of these libations is obvious, and their significance is the same, whether Æschylus is attributing a purely Greek rite to the foreign queen, or conceives of the Persians as practising an analogous custom. In either case, the Queen, Atossa, presents at the tomb of Darius Hystaspes an offering for which the Greeks used a distinctive technical term "pelanos" (πέλανος). By this word they designated the food and drink of the Xthonic deities and the shades in Hades. The nature and significance of these offerings were more clearly brought out in the term "soothing-gifts" (μειλικτήρια), which was frequently applied to them.[13]

In the light of the data which has been presented, the nature of the offering of water, with both the Greeks and the Assyro-Babylonians, can be clearly understood. The water served one of two purposes. First, it was conceived of as slaking the thirst of the spirits of the dead, just as offerings of food satisfied their hunger. Again, the water might be regarded as a sacrificial offering intended to placate the spirits of the departed or the deities of the lower world. It is to be kept in mind that in animistic types of religion no very clear or sharp distinction is drawn between the spirits and these deities, for in the course of time the spirits of the dead are frequently raised to the dignity of the latter. In consequence, food and drink, which were originally furnished for the satisfaction of the actual needs of the spirits of the departed ancestors or chiefs, would easily come to be regarded as sacrificial offerings when these spirits had been promoted to the rank of gods. Thus a rite, which in its origin was inspired either by filial piety or fear of the ghosts of the departed, might easily in the course of time

[13] For a full discussion of these Greek rites, the reader is referred to *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, by J. E. Harrison, pp. 88–91. Cf. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 531.

be transmuted into a constituent part of the ritual of expiation or penitence.

It is in harmony with the facts in other fields of religion to assume that the primitive Hebrews, prior to the advent of the great prophets, practised many rites which are characteristic of animism. As the offering of food and drink to spirits was one of the commonest of such rites in primitive religion, it is most natural to assume that the Hebrews followed the custom in some of its many forms. The early Hebrews would be a remarkable exception if they had no rites for the spirits of the departed, whether located in Sheol or elsewhere, and the water libation may well have been one of these rites. But as Yahweh of the prophets tolerated no rivals, and their ethical monotheism relegated the shades in Sheol to the limbo of heathen superstition, the water libation with its animistic associations would either be banished altogether or its symbolism completely changed. That it finally fell into disuse or was banished from the religion of Israel because it smacked of paganism, is amply attested by its omission from the list of offerings which are enumerated in the Priestly Code.

In an earlier age, when the ceremony of the water libation was still used as by a prophet like Samuel, it had already been transmuted into a symbol of penitence. The process of reasoning, whereby an act associated with the reverence of the spirits of the deceased could be transformed into a rite expressive of contrition, may not be very evident to the modern mind. Yet there are analogies close at hand in the field of religion, in fact, in the religion of Israel itself, which show that a rite or practice may in the course of time take on a new significance. Frequently no logical connexion can be found between the various associations of a particular practice, rite, or custom. The nearest analogy and best illustration is fasting. In Christianity and later Judaism,

it is an act of self-denial expressive of contrition, and when this suggestion of the act grows dim it becomes a part of a barren ascetism. But if we go no further in our study of fasting, we know little of the part which it has played in the religious consciousness of man. Outside the pale of the Biblical religion the symbolism of fasting is exceedingly varied and complex. "It may be an act of penitence or of propitiation; a preparatory rite before some act of sacramental eating or an initiation; a mourning ceremony; one of a series of purificatory rites; a means of inducing dreams and visions; a method of adding force to magical rites." [14] With the primitive Hebrews, fasting may have served any or all of these purposes, but in the Old Testament it has two main suggestions. It is frequently alluded to as a mourning custom (1 Sam. xxxi. 13; cf. 1 Chron. x. 13; 2 Sam. i. 12, iii. 35), and it is recognised as an appropriate way in which genuine penitence may express itself (Lev. xvi. 29, Jud. xx. 26, Jonah iii. 5 ff.). As a mourning custom, fasting is unquestionably in its origin connected with animistic ideas of the spirits of departed relatives and friends. In the religion of Israel the ethical monotheism of the prophets changed the associations of the practice so that it became an act of self-denial expressive of grief. We may not be able to determine whether the other meaning which fasting has in the Old Testament grew out of its use as a symbol of sorrow or has an independent origin, nevertheless the fact remains that it had these two significations which are not naturally connected in the modern mind. In a similar way, the rite of pouring water over a grave, either to minister to or to appease the spirits of ancestors, could take on an entirely different significance in the religion of the prophets. They would either ethicise it or discard it. Unquestionably an Amos or an Isaiah would

[14] Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, v. 759a.

put little value on such a rite, and it is evident from its omission from the Priestly Code that even the priests found it inappropriate in the ceremonial of the Temple. So it disappeared from the legitimate religion of Israel. The ceremonial of water-pouring in connexion with the Feast of Tabernacles, as celebrated in Herod's Temple—as has been observed in an earlier section of this paper—is an instance of mimetic magic and probably was introduced under Hellenic influence.

It remains for us to notice briefly the traces of the rite as they are found in poetical figures of speech, which gain both in naturalness and force when their origin is found in the rite of the water libation as a symbolic expression of penitence and sorrow. In an exhortation to prayer, a poet of the exile exclaims :—

"Arise, cry out in the night, at the beginnings of the watches,
Pour out thy heart like water before the face of the Lord." (Lam. ii. 19a.)

How meaningless is the simile "like water" to the Occidental reader of the passage, but with what impressive force it would appeal to an ancient Hebrew who was suffering in exile for the sins of his fathers, when he recalled that his ancestors had been accustomed to pour out water before Yahweh to give expression to the penitence of their hearts. The exile, with the more spiritual conception of religion which he had learned from the prophets, was called upon "to pour out" not water but "the heart like water."

The Targum has paraphrased the three words at considerable length, and the comparison with water, which this early Jewish interpreter gives, strongly supports the argument of the preceding paragraph. The paraphrase of the Targum is as follows :

שְׁדִיאִי הֵיךְ מַיָּא עַקְמוּמִית לְבֵיךְ וְהַדְרִי בְתִיוּבְתָא
וְצַלִּיאִי בְּבֵית כְּנִשְׁתָּא כָּל קֳבֵל אַפֵּי יְיָ

We may translate it, "pour out as water the perversity of thy heart and repent in penitence and pray in the house of the congregation before the face of Yahweh." It is difficult to see how the Targumist could have used the comparison "as water" (הֵיךְ מַיָּא) in his paraphrase of the idea of the pouring out of the heart, unless there were present in his mind a reminiscence of the rite of the water libation as a symbol of penitence.

In the same chapter (Lam. ii. 11) there is a strange expression, not found elsewhere in the Old Testament, a *crux interpretum* from the earliest times. Here the anguish of the poet reaches its climax in the line—

"*My liver is poured out* upon the earth because of the destruction of the daughter of my people."

Such is the literal translation of the Massoretic text,[15] but it is evident that the imagination of the early translators could not grasp the pouring out of the liver. For this reason both the LXX and the Syriac pointed כְּבֵדִי instead of כָּבְדִי, and then gave a commonplace translation, *ἐξεχύθη εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡ δόξα μου*. Many a modern commentator, like the ancient translator, has failed to see the force of the metaphor preserved in the Massoretic pointing, and with lack of poetic imagination and yet with great assurance he has asserted that the *liver is not a fluid*.[16] But, in the light of the facts concerning the water libation set forth in this paper, how natural the metaphor of the "pouring out of the liver" would be to a Hebrew poet, when we recall that to him as to all the Semites the liver was the seat of the affections and the centre of the emotional life. If the

[15] נִשְׁפַּךְ לָאָרֶץ כְּבֵדִי

[16] Could exegesis be more commonplace and with less touch of the imagination than the statement of Giesebrecht in *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, ad loc.*, "Die Leber ist kein flüssiger Körper wie דָּם und מֹרָרָתִי (Job xvi. 13), von denen das Prädicat שָׁפַךְ gebraucht werden dürfte"?

water libation was acceptable to Yahweh as a symbol of contrition, with how much greater favour would He look upon the man who in his anguish for sin would pour out the contents of the organ of the body that was the very seat of the emotions connected with sorrow and penitence.[17]

JAMES A. KELSO.

[17] In two other passages, Job iii. 24 and Ps. xxii. 14, where the *tertium comparationis* is water, the force of the simile is evidently quite different. In the latter instance the sufferer of the great Passion Psalm gives utterance to his helplessness in the expression, "I am poured out like water." Here the point of the comparison likely lies in the instability of water. In Job iii. 24, where the poet puts the words "And my groanings are poured out like water" into the mouth of the patriarch, he is laying emphasis on the unbroken continuity of the agony of suffering.

## *SOME RECENT TENDENCIES IN THE CRITICISM OF THE GOSPELS.*

It is the aim of this paper to raise the question of the significance of the words and earthly life of Jesus Christ for the Christianity of the first century. The attempt to bring so large a problem within the scope of a single article requires an apology, and my apology is this : for the last three years I have been trying to teach the New Testament, and as I have read some of the current literature on Primitive Christianity and the Gospels, I have been struck by the divergences in the interpretations which competent scholars put upon the evidence at our disposal, and even in single works I seem to myself to detect incompatible lines of thought. I have tried in this paper to bring into relief some of these tendencies in criticism which appear to me to be in conflict one with another, in the hope that I may thus help to prepare the way for a more satisfactory account of the first Christian century.

In the course of the second century the Christian Church came to recognise four authoritative versions of the life and work of Jesus Christ. Of these four, two were believed to have been composed by personal disciples of the Lord, while the other two were believed to perpetuate the tradition as handed down by the two premier apostles—Peter and Paul. The Church built well. For sixteen hundred years the fourfold gospel canon was accepted by Christendom as a matter of course. The Fathers of the Church recognised a difference in emphasis between one gospel and another,

but it was generally assumed that the gospels must agree, and that they were all equally historical. The Patristic tradition persisted through the Middle Age and it was not challenged at the revival of learning. Erasmus is content to prefix to his text of each gospel and to his Paraphrases excerpts from Jerome and other ancient writers, which record the testimony of antiquity to their authorship. It was not until the rise of historical criticism in the second half of the eighteenth century that the origin of the gospels was seriously reconsidered. Lessing's volume on the gospels, published in 1778, provides a useful landmark in the history of gospel criticism. The title of the work reveals the temper of the age—*Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten als bloss menschliche Geschichtschreiber betrachtet*; Biblical study is emancipating itself from the presuppositions which the conception of the Inspired Canon had encouraged. During the nineteenth century Germany maintained the lead in Biblical studies which the intellectual movement of the closing years of the eighteenth century had secured to her: the works of the Tübingen School represent a systematic attempt to read the New Testament documents in a historical setting, and if their drastic reconstruction of the beginnings of Christianity was at once too abstract and too ambitious, yet it prepared the way for a more sober and more concrete interpretation by the historical school which supplanted it.

This is not the place to examine the causes which account for the isolation of English theology during the first half of the nineteenth century, but the fact itself is important. For the critical study of the gospels Herbert Marsh's volume on *The Origin and Composition of the Three First Canonical Gospels* (1801) stands alone, and Marsh had no successor of importance except Connop Thirlwall, who in 1825 published a translation of Schleiermacher's *St. Luke* with an introduction. There was no systematic Biblical scholarship in

England until Stanley and Jowett began work on the Pauline Epistles in the 'fifties. From this time onwards England, and particularly Cambridge, produced first-rate work upon parts of the New Testament, but Victorian scholarship betrayed a strange reluctance to grapple with the problem of the gospels. In the year 1860, in the midst of the outcry over *Essays and Reviews*, three young Cambridge graduates, Fenton John Antony Hort, Brooke Foss Westcott and Joseph Barber Lightfoot decided to collaborate in editing all the books of the New Testament with introductions and notes. Hort's correspondence with Lightfoot and Westcott on this proposal is of great interest. In a etter to Lightfoot dated April 29, 1860, Hort proposed the following division of labour: Westcott was to take St. John's Gospel, the Apocalypse and the Johannine Epistles; Lightfoot was to take all the Pauline Epistles and *Hebrews*, while Hort proposed that he himself should take the synoptic gospels, *Acts*, and the Epistles of James, Peter and Jude.[1] Lightfoot, however, demurred to the proposed distribution: he was not sure whether Hort was the man to undertake the synoptic gospels, and he told Hort of his misgivings. On May 1, Hort wrote in answer as follows:—"I am extremely obliged to you for expressing plainly your doubts about my taking the synoptic gospels. . . . If your idea is to have an uniform commentary, which shall demonstrate that the final results of accurate and honest criticism do not disturb 'orthodox' assumptions, you are quite right not to admit a coadjutor who cannot feel certain of having equal good luck . . . As far as I can see at present I should shrink from transferring myself to other books of the New Testament in your scheme on the ground that you could not trust me with the gospels."[2] Lightfoot appears to have repudiated this interpretation of his views with some warmth, and on

[1] *Life of Hort*, vol. I, p. 417. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 418.

May 4 Hort wrote again: "You will see that my last was written under a great misapprehension . . . so pray don't be angry." A letter to Westcott dated the same day gives us I think the true ground of difference between Hort and his colleagues. "You will see," he writes, "that I misunderstood the words and still more the tone of Lightfoot's previous letter. . . . I quite agree that it is most essential to study each synoptist by himself as a single whole. Only I should add that such a study soon leads one to the fact of their having all largely used at least one common source, and that fact becomes an *additional* element in their criticism. Their independent treatment is most striking; but it is not identical with the independence of three absolutely original writers." [1] Hort and Hort alone had grasped the real nature of the synoptic problem. So it was agreed that Hort should take the synoptic gospels. But alas! in a letter to the Rev. John Ellerton, dated February 15, 1861, Hort writes: "We have agreed to defer the gospels till last." [2] The work was never done; and whereas in dealing with St. Paul the scholar of our day has behind him Jowett's penetrating dissertations and Lightfoot's massive comments, when he comes to the gospels he is dependent, so far as English work is concerned, upon the commentaries of lesser men. There was nothing to represent the position of the Cambridge triumvirate except Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. This book, which appeared in the same momentous year 1860, was an enlarged edition of a volume published nine years earlier under the title *Elements of the Gospel Harmony*. It was again revised in 1866 and 1872, and, finally, reached an eighth edition in 1895. Now it is intelligible that a writer in 1851 should not have grasped the fact that Lachmann's work in 1835 had really established the priority of Mark, for this was not generally realised even

[1] *Ibid.* p. 423. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

in Germany, but it is indeed surprising to find the following passage in the 1872 edition and the subsequent reprints after the conversion of Ewald, Ritschl and Holtzmann to the priority of Mark : " It is evident that the assumption of a mutual dependence, while it may explain the general coincidences between the Gospels, offers no explanation of the peculiar distribution of the differences between the several narratives " (p. 201).

Since the closing years of last century English theology has made up for lost time. Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, Dr. Armitage Robinson's *Introduction to the Gospels*, Professor Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, Dr. Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents, Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*—these and other contributions have raised English critical work on the gospels to a level with that of the Continent, and in so doing they have revolutionised the outlook of English theology. Catholic Christianity of old times started from the fourfold Gospel Canon. Here were the inspired records of Apostles who had beheld the Incarnate Life ! Consciously or unconsciously Christians formed their picture of the life of Christ by combining and harmonising the fourfold record and then, with this picture presupposed, they proceeded to the great story of Christ's victory over the world, as recorded in *The Acts of the Apostles* and in the Epistles of St. Paul. The Cambridge triumvirate retained the traditional perspective, and it is because that perspective is to-day seen and felt to be impossible that the old school no longer grips. Just as we want to ask questions, answers cease to be forthcoming. The historical student to-day feels firm ground beneath his feet when he deals with the primitive Church. He would like to know more than he does, but he can check himself by first-hand documents, written by the principal actor in the piece. No such authorities are at hand for the real

beginnings of Christianity. We have no contemporary documents for the life of Christ, and it is improbable that any of the documents, bearing on the subject, which we do possess are to be ascribed to a personal follower of the Lord. We can only read the story as it came to be told in the Churches 40, 50, 70 years after the events themselves took place. Thus we may no longer combine the four gospels into one whole and without more ado regard this combination as the presupposition of the Epistles and the Acts. In some sense at any rate the Epistles presuppose the career of Jesus : they do not presuppose our records of that career. Thus far there is general agreement among scholars, but it is here that our difficulties begin. What was commonly known about our Lord's life in the early communities ? What place did the earthly life and teaching hold in early Christianity ? It is certain that the primitive Church was dominated by the expectation of the future coming of its Lord : did this expectation render the Christians indifferent to the lowly life in Palestine ? or did it heighten their interest in the historic words and acts of Him who was to come again ?

Professor Burkitt's lectures on *The Gospel History and its Transmission* introduce us to the heart of the problem. Professor Burkitt sticks closely to the documents. He shows us clearly that the first and third gospels depend on the second, and he convinces us that the few cases in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in the material common to the three do not require us to postulate an *Ur-Marcus*. Mark is the primary document, and for our knowledge of the life of Jesus everything depends upon the value which we find ourselves justified in ascribing to it. The Professor is disposed to ascribe to it a very high historical value. The events develop in an intelligible way, and when we can find points of contact with secular history,

secular history confirms the evangelist. And in addition to this our confidence is enhanced when we reflect that the evangelist would have no motive to lead him to doctor the tradition, for most of the events recorded would have no especial interest for the Christians of his time. Let me quote the striking words in which Professor Burkitt urges this argument. "It is the peculiar merit of St. Mark's Gospel," he says, "from the point of view of the historical investigator, that it deals mainly with a circle of events foreign to the life and interests of the growing Christian communities" (*op. cit.*, p. 61). Mark, then, is the primary historical source for the life of Christ, and having taken up this position we must stick to it. Professor Burkitt likes a document. Mark is a document: Q is a hypothesis. Professor Burkitt is accordingly cautious in his use of Q. We can feel no security as to its contents or its characteristics. Again, the Johannine scheme cannot be accommodated to the Marcan, and "if the narrative of Mark has a historical background, and in its main outline and arrangement fits without violence into the framework of secular circumstance and events, we are not at liberty seriously to disturb the proportions of this narrative, or to change its general character, in order to interpolate into it stories derived from a wholly different view of the Ministry" (*op. cit.*, p. 103). Thus Professor Burkitt's high estimate of the historical value of Mark secures us a vital point of contact with the historical Jesus, but his estimate of the value of Mark is largely determined by the alleged fact that the first Christians were indifferent to the records of His earthly life. "The interest of the nascent Church was not in the least directed towards the past" (*op. cit.*, p. 264).

There are four considerations which appear to me to tell against this estimate of the attitude of the early Christians towards the earthly life of Jesus.

(1) What was Mark's motive in writing his Gospel as he did, if a large part of its contents was not likely to be of interest to his readers ?

(2) If the Christians of that period were not interested in records of the earthly life, how are we to account for the wide influence which Mark appears to have exercised ? Professor Burkitt maintains in his smaller and later volume, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, that " there is nothing in Christian literature to indicate that the Gospel of Mark was ever popular or official " (p. 53) ; but does not the fact that Mark was used independently by two such different writers as the authors of the first and third gospels suggest that it was for a time a standard authority ?

(3) If the first Christians were not interested in Christ's earthly life, what do we make of Q ? Professor Burkitt recognises the importance of Christ's ethical teaching for the early Church, but it is surely not possible entirely to dissociate the essentially occasional ethical teaching of the gospels from the events of the life. Q. at all events appears not to have done so.

Lastly (4), are there not indications in the second gospel itself that the author has combined and arranged traditional narratives ? I cannot now deal with this in detail : one instance must suffice. It is often held that Mark vi. 30–52 (the feeding of the 5,000 and a subsequent crossing of the lake), and Mark viii. 1–22 (the feeding of the 4,000 and a subsequent crossing of the lake) are variant versions of the same cycle of events. If this be admitted, we must suppose that different versions of the Galilean ministry did circulate freely among the Christians before St. Mark wrote. Professor Burkitt does not refer to this particular instance, but in his later book he appears to be willing to allow some such origin for some of the narratives. He records his impression " that many of the tales may be traditional, told perhaps

again and again, and that some are already on the point of becoming conventionalised and epic" (*Earliest Sources*, p. 82), but I do not see how to reconcile that admission with this interpretation of the mind of the early Church, which I quote from an earlier chapter in the same book: "What was the use of looking back to the humble life of the Son of God on earth, save perhaps to record his final victory over death, which was the earnest and prelude of his immediately expected Presence in glory? In the events of his earthly career the believers took little interest . . . " (*ibid.*, p. 10).

I think, then, that I may sum up in this one question the difficulty which I feel with regard to Professor Burkitt's theory of the gospels: If the first Christians were not interested in records of the earthly life of Jesus, how is it that the gospel literature ever came into existence?

In the third section of the first volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake set themselves to discover the motives which influenced the writers of the gospels. The gospels, they remind us, are primary authorities, not for the life of Jesus, but for the thought of the Apostolic Age. They do not rate the historical value of Mark so high as does Professor Burkitt, and at every stage in the gospel records they detect the influence of later doctrine and organisation. The purpose of Mark's Gospel is described as follows: "In common with the other evangelists, Mark desires to explain the reason for the breach between the Church and the Synagogue, tracing it back to the beginning, and showing that it was due, not to any schismatic conduct on the part of the Jesus and his followers, but to the rejection by the Jews of the Messiah whom they ought to have recognised in him, as his disciples had done, on the ground, not of his own assertion, but of the sufficient testimony of miracles, of demons, and of the divine voice from Heaven" (*op. cit.*,

p. 267 f.). The editors of this work differ from Professor Burkitt in their conception of the temper of early Christianity. They *do* picture Mark and his readers as deeply interested in the past, for it is in the past history of Jesus that they find arguments to support their own ecclesiastical position. It remains to be seen whether the motive suggested by the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* does give us the clue to St. Mark. According to the editors St. Mark brings out a threefold testimony which actually convinced the disciples and ought to have convinced the Jews that Jesus was Messiah—the testimony of miracles, of demons, and of the divine voice from heaven. Now St. Mark recounts eighteen miracles of various kinds performed by Jesus. On no single occasion, I believe, does the evangelist let slip one word which suggests that these miracles were intended to provide, or ought to have provided, to Jews or disciples a proof that Jesus was Messiah. On the contrary Jesus, according to Mark, makes every effort to check the excitement and to avoid the publicity which His miracles occasioned. With regard to the testimony of devils, we are thrice told that Jesus was acclaimed by demoniacs as "Son of God most High," or "The Holy One of God." One of these occasions was the healing of the Gadarene demoniac; but as the disciples alone are recorded to have been then present, St. Mark's readers could not have supposed that this ought to have convinced the Jewish people of the Messiahship. In Mark i. 25 we are told that Jesus rebuked the demoniac for his confession; in Mark i. 34 "he suffered not the devils to speak because they knew him," and in Mark iii. 12, "he strictly charged the unclean spirits that they should not make him known." The third sufficient testimony which, according to Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake, Mark's readers would suppose ought to have convinced the Jews that Jesus was Messiah, was the divine voice from

heaven. Our authors do not indicate whether they refer to the divine voice at the Baptism or that at the Transfiguration. Equal difficulties beset either alternative. Mark's very brief version of the Baptism of Jesus makes it clear that in his view it was Jesus alone who saw the heavens opened and the spirit descending like a dove, and it is, I imagine, probable that he thought that Jesus alone heard the voice, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well-pleased." At any rate we are not told of anybody else who did hear it; still less that it ought to have been a sign to the Jews, or that it was actually a sign to the disciples—if there were any at that time. The voice at the Transfiguration can only have been heard by Jesus and by the inner circle of the three apostles; and as Mark goes on to tell us that "as they were coming down from the mountain he charged them to tell nobody what they had seen until the Son of Man was risen from the dead," it is difficult to see how an early Christian could have supposed that this event ought to have enabled the Jews to recognise the Messiah On the whole, then, one is inclined to feel that the editors overstate the case when they proceed: "All this is invaluable to the historian. . . . It provides us with an early and authoritative statement of the evidence by which the first Greek-speaking Christians justified their own position" (*op. cit.*, p. 268).

The present condition of New Testament criticism is, I think, partly to be accounted for by the past history of the subject. The Victorian scholars were unwilling to admit conclusions with regard to the gospels, which a closer examination of the evidence has rendered inevitable, and their influence postponed unduly the recognition of the problem. The gospels, as Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake remind us, are *primary* authorities, not for the history of Jesus, but for the thought of the Apostolic Age.

This admission has at once disintegrated the old interpretation of the documents, and it has overwhelmed British scholarship with problems which we are far from having solved. Professor Burkitt would like to exempt St. Mark from this generalisation. St. Mark's Gospel, he holds, does not represent the thought or the interests of his time, and therefore it may be regarded as a generally reliable outline of the career of Christ, thus affording us a criterion by which we may judge the other evangelists. It is indeed clear that Mark is a criterion by which to judge Matthew and Luke where they are dependent upon him; but does Professor Burkitt allow sufficiently for the fact that Mark is not the sole line of tradition? We may or we may not be convinced by Canon Streeter's weighty arguments for the dependence of Mark on Q,[1] but in any case the non-Marcan sections common to the first and third gospels could not be treated as later amplifications of Mark. They represent an independent tradition, which, like Mark, appears to have carried weight with the contemporaries of "Matthew" and Luke, and which probably circulated widely in different recensions.

Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake are concerned to maintain two theses: first, the gospels are but poor historical sources for the life of Christ, for they reflect the apologetic aims of apostolic Christianity. But do the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* realise what formidable objections they are thus raising to their own second thesis, which is that Christianity started as a Jewish sect and later passed into a mystery cult of the Lord Jesus Christ? If it be true that Christianity began as a Jewish sect and then, forgetting its original idea, changed into a mystery cult; and if it be further true that the synoptic gospels reflect not so much the actual life of Jesus as early Greek Christian

[1] *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 165 f.

ideas about Him, then surely we should expect to find the synoptic gospels penetrated with the ideas of a Greek mystery religion. But this they obviously are not, and the more impressed you are by the atmosphere of mystery-religion in early Christianity, the more convinced you ought to become of the essential historicity of the synoptic portrait; or conversely, the more you emphasise the point that the synoptic gospels reflect not the historic Jesus, but the thought of early Greek Christians about Him, the more sceptical you ought to grow as to the dominance of Hellenistic sacramentalism in the primitive Church.

Let me conclude by asking whether there is serious reason why we should not accept the conclusion which many probabilities suggest—that the Christians of the fifth and sixth decades of the first century treasured and repeated records of the words and deeds of Jesus. Our gospels they did not know; the ancestors of our gospels, oral or written or both, they must surely have known and used familiarly. The principal argument which is alleged against this assumption is the paucity of references to the sayings and deeds of the Lord in the Pauline Epistles. Dr. Stanton and Professor Harnack have illustrated the weakness of this argument by appealing to the analogous case of *The Acts of the Apostles*. *The Acts of the Apostles* is not concerned with the earthly life of Jesus. It is the Spirit, poured out by the exalted Christ, which dominates the story. No saying of the Lord is recorded save one, and this is found in no canonical gospel. How easy to infer that the author knew little and cared less about the earthly prelude! In the case of *The Acts of the Apostles* we do not so reason, because the third gospel is there to refute us. In the case of St. Paul we have no document to testify to his knowledge of the Lord's life, but the analogy of *The Acts* is enough to show how precarious it is to argue from silence to ignorance. St. Paul was not

perpetually quoting the words and deeds of Jesus in his letters because he was writing about other things, but to appreciate his epistles we need to form some conception of the associations which his words would suggest to his readers, and I would ask whether it is not reasonable to suppose that to him and to them the name of Jesus carried with it the thought of Him Who was baptized by John, Who foiled the devil, Who proclaimed God's kingdom, Who blessed the poor, Who healed the sick, Who welcomed the sinner, Who gave Himself to the death of shame and rose in power to God's right hand—all this at once. It was all a cherished memory of the Church and for this reason—that same Jesus was to come again and unite the faithful to Himself in the age to come. St. Paul's language about knowing the Risen rather than the earthly Christ seems to me to support this view. "Henceforward," he writes to the Corinthians, "we know no man after the flesh; even if we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." The argument presupposes traditions of the earthly life; if traditions of the historic Jesus were not current, the antithesis has no force. The historic life, he says in effect, is past, and we know now Christ by the Spirit. But for Paul Christ Risen is the same as He who in his humiliation had lived and taught and died on earth.

J. M. Creed.

## *ARTIFICIAL VARIANTS IN THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

The title which I have put at the head of this paper is somewhat obscure: are not all variations from the true text of a document artificial products, the results of a conscious or an unconscious art, unconscious in the case of the scribe as he patiently toils at a task from which

error cannot be excluded, conscious in the case of a reader or critic, who thinks he knows better than the author what the author wrote or should have written?

I was, however, thinking of phenomena of a much narrower range. The text of the New Testament is overloaded with variety: there are readings which are not really readings at all, in the sense that you have to balance this against that, and sit on a judgment seat and announce a verdict. There are cases that ought never to waste the time of a revising barrister. One particular species is in my mind and may be discussed for a while with actual illustrations, the case where a passage of the New Testament has been translated out of its Greek into some other language, and then subsequently retranslated back out of Latin, say, or Syriac, or Coptic into Greek, so as to produce a shadow text over against the original. Obviously the variations of such a retranslated text would be artificial variants, and if we could be quite sure which text was the original text and which the retranslation, we should never trouble over the secondary form any more, nor need we be at the pains of recording it. That is a very simple way of stating the case; the important word in the sentence is the little word "*if*." Are we sure that the flow of the text was from A through B to C: may it not have been in the reverse order, with C for the original form?

Now this question is not an idle speculation. We can give it bodily shape by discussing a concrete case. In the second century, we know that a large part of the New Testament was canonised, and given an orderly sequence and authoritative form by Marcion, the so-called heretic, whom Tertullian, amongst others, refutes both as to his doctrine and as to the changes which he makes in the text. As, however, the greater part of the evidence for the text of Marcion comes from the Latin of Tertullian, we have

before us the question as to the character of the Greek text which underlies the renderings and the quotations of Tertullian. Naturally, the most obvious thing to do was to retranslate Marcion's or Tertullian's Latin into a word-for-word Greek equivalent and call this the Greek text of Marcion in the middle of the second century. Suppose, for instance, we took Zahn's reconstruction, we should find that not only did we recover a large part of what we may call the Catholic text, but we also should have before us a series of passages in which (allowing for such cases in which Marcion may have altered the text to suit his peculiar views) we have a Greek text which never existed and ought never to have been created. The readings are not even Marcionisms, they are Zahnisms, and as such they have no place in the apparatus of the N.T. Accordingly when Harnack produced his monumental study of Marcion, and Marcion's views and Marcion's Biblical text, he followed in the footsteps of Zahn as his precursor, but he followed very warily. He did not mean to fall into the mistake which Zahn had made; but we shall see presently, from an instance, that he did not wholly escape the contagion of a fallacious method.

It is easy for us to play the judge in certain cases. We should, for example, have no hesitation in discarding the Greek text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, which was manufactured by some monk for Erasmus' third edition; nor should we attach any importance to Erasmus' own completion of the last verses of the Apocalypse from a retranslated Latin; but it is not so easy to see that the same thing has happened with the text of Marcion, and that Zahn often, and Harnack sometimes, must be put on one side. Let us take a case in which Zahn goes hopelessly wrong, and where Harnack does not go helpfully right.

In discussing Marcion's text of Luke xiv 16 ff. Tertullian

tells us that the master of the house, who had prepared the feast from which successive guests begged to be excused, was *moved* at the refusal of his invitations, and orders them to be offered to a humbler and a more widely-sought constituency. Tertullian remembered that Marcion's God, the God of the N.T., was of a different temper from the Creator God of the O.T., of whom he says.

> "Deus melior inventus est, qui nec offenditur nec irascitur nec ulciscitur."—(C. Marc. i. 27).

Tertullian evidently thinks he has caught Marcion in the admission of a text of Luke which does not agree with his theory of a good-natured God. This is one for my side, says he, this word *motus* :

> "Hoc ut patrifamiliae renuntiatum est, *motus* tunc (bene quod et *motus*, negat enim Marcion *moveri* deum suum, ita et hic meus est) mandat de plateis et vicis civitatis facere sublectionem."

Now let us see what Zahn will make of this. He finds fault with those who equate Marcion's *motus* with the catholic text ὀργισθείς on the ground that if the Greek text were really ὀργισθείς Tertullian would have had a much stronger case by reading *iratus* instead of *motus* to express the emotion of the master of the house who, it is agreed, represents parabolically the Supreme Being. So Zahn manufactures a new Greek variant, and tells us that Marcion read κινηθείς, which would, of course, by literal translation give us *motus*.[1]

Zahn did not, however, understand that *motus* in popular speech meant *angered* and was a proper translation of ὀργισθείς, so he made what I call an artificial variant, which ought never to have found its way into the textual apparatus. For instance, in the *Acta Perpetuae*, when Perpetua tells us that her father was *enraged* by her persistence in affirming herself a Christian, and that the old man

[1] Zahn, *Kanon*, ii. 452, 478.

rushed at her as if he would have torn out her eyes:

"tunc pater *motus* in hoc verbo misit se in me ut oculos mihi erueret." [1] (*Acta Perp.* 3).

As is well known, there is reason to refer these *Acta* to the pen in part, and the editorial care throughout, of Tertullian, and we notice that we have here the same usage of *motus* for anger as in the Lucan text; but we must not hastily draw the conclusion that we are dealing with *African* Latin; for at this point Harnack comes to our aid and gives us good reason for believing that Tertullian deals directly with Marcion's Latin, and is not, generally speaking, occupied with translating Marcion's Greek. Then Marcion as well as Tertullian uses *motus* in the sense of *iratus*, and the whole argument of Zahn collapses: he has made an imaginary Greek reading *κινηθείς*, he has made a wrong objection to the real Greek reading *ὀργισθείς*, as furnishing a stronger counter-agreement to Marcion's passionless God than *κινηθείς* would supply and he did not see that Tertullian was actually making his objection to Marcion's views on the ground of Marcion's own text.

Now it is unfortunate that Harnack and Soden both follow Zahn's method of restoration, and so present us with a N.T. variant in Luc. xiv., which never existed. Harnack goes to work on the passage in which Tertullian is commenting on Luc. xiv. (15–24), picks out the textual fragments and restores them from Latin to Greek. When he comes to *motus*, he gives us, with some hesitation, *ἐπαρθείς* as an equivalent, and adds a note that it is either *ἐπαρθείς* = (stirred up) or *κινηθείς* = (moved), and that this is a "tendency" reading of Marcion's for *ὀργισθείς*. He had forgotten that it was his own argument that Marcion's

[1] If the Greek of the *Acta* is here a translation of the Latin, as seems fairly certain, then the translator has also misunderstood *motus*, which he renders by *ταραχθείς*.

text is Tertullian's Latin. It is safe to say that *ἐπαρθείς* is as little to be found in Marcion as *κινηθείς*. When we turn to Soden, we find similar textual misadventure.

In his *Introduction* (§ 376=p. 1627) he gives a list of passages where Marcion's text varies from the common ancestry of the Catholic tradition, and is under the influence of Marcionite ideas; against Luc. xiv. 21 he notes that Marcion reads *κινηθείς loco ὀργισθείς* but concludes that such a reading does not belong to the original text of Luke, though his reason for its exclusion is fallacious. The real reason is that *κινηθείς* never existed! No doubt Marcion ought to have altered the text but he didn't. The foregoing illustration will show how easy it is to manufacture and to imagine variations in the text of the New Testament.

Having gone so far with the explanation of the word *motus* in Tertullian and Marcion, we can hardly avoid referring to another case in the N.T. where a similar misunderstanding may have occurred.

In Mark i. 41 (the story of the healing of the leper), the text, as commonly edited, reads:

*ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο.*

A reference to the critical apparatus shows decided traces of a variant *ὀργισθείς* for *σπλαγχνισθείς* (Jesus was *angry*, and stretched out his hand, etc.); now this is certainly a case of the harder reading so much loved by critics of a certain temper of mind; it is a reading which, if it ever existed, would have been repulsive both to Catholic and to Marcionite: to the Catholic because it is the wrong place and the wrong person to provoke the ire of Jesus; to the Marcionite because the Good God did not send His Son into the world to be angered with anybody, certainly not with lepers, who had turned worshipful and needed pity. But, on the other hand, the textual evidence for it is very

early and very decided. A group of Western authorities, such as *D a ff*$^2$ *r*$^1$ support the harder text. Not only so, but it was also the reading of the *Diatessaron*, as we can prove in the following manner.

When we turn to Ephrem's commentary upon the *Diatessaron* we find him discoursing in this wise:

(p. 144). "*If thou wilt, thou canst.* The method and the manner are those of suppliants, the words are the words of doubters. And the Lord showed two things to these two attitudes, first reproof, when *he was angry with him*, and then *pity*, when he healed him. He was angry at his saying, *If thou wilt*; He healed him because he added *thou canst*. . . .

"The Lord was not *angry* with him, but with his leprosy. . . . The Lord showed *by his anger* that he did not respect persons when he healed. . . . The Lord was *angry* at the thoughts of the leper."

There can be no doubt that *ὀργισθείς* had its equivalent in the Tatian text. Ephrem turns the word this way and that way, in order to extract a meaning from it which shall not derogate from the honour of our Lord. No doubt he had a Syriac equivalent for *ὀργισθείς* before him: the question, however, arises whether he did not also have the other reading, according to which Jesus *had compassion*. If he had both readings, it may be urged that one of them is an alternative for the other, and, as far back as the time of Michaelis, attempts were made to show that the whole trouble arose in Syriac, by the copying of the word *ethraḥam* (he had pity) as *ethraʿem* (he was enraged). There is, however, no reason to resort to Syriac nor to change the spelling. Our previous investigation shows us how a word *ὀργισθείς* was likely to be done into Latin, or out of it. We have shown that this reading is attested by Tatian and by certain western authorities. If we can find at this

point of the text the Latin reading *motus*, we shall not hesitate to banish ὀργισθείς from the Western text, in spite of its early attestation and occurrence in Syriac. Just at this very point we are 'gravelled' for lack of evidence. The Latin text of Mark says *iratus* according to *d a ff*$^2$ and *r*$^1$. The form *motus* has not yet turned up in our Latin MSS.

Then we can hardly treat ὀργισθείς as a retranslation which was made before the time of Tatian, and which would require us to admit the existence of a Latin text of Mark before Tatian.

At this point Synoptic criticism comes to the aid of textual criticism. We observe that Matthew and Luke, who are working over the text of Mark, both omit the clause which says that Jesus was angry (*or* pitiful). It is in the highest degree unlikely that they would have omitted σπλαγχισθείς if they had found it in Mark; on the other hand, it is altogether likely that they would have omitted ὀργισθείς. Then we suggest that this was the original Marcan reading, whatever may be its ultimate origin, and we retain it in the text, throwing in our lot, for this time, with the harder reading. We notice that the Lewis Syriac does not follow Tatian in the peculiar reading; it has "Jesus had compassion"; there is no difficulty, then, in our finding a trace of this reading in Ephrem.

Rendel Harris.

## *THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.*

. . . The Baptist stood baptizing in the stream
Till sun-down. Then when all the rest were gone
There came Another One;
He seemed to beg for baptism, and John
Half seemed to say Him no;
But then we saw the gleam
Of the last level sunbeam gild His hair
Into an aureole as He stood there,
Pure from the laving stream.
And as He made to go
We saw the Baptist bending low
To kiss His feet; and in the dusk above,
Like benediction given
By well-pleased heaven,
One hovering white-winged dove.

. . . . .

Six weeks passed by;
Simon went yonder home. But Andrew and I
Still served the Baptist, but we often thought
Of the sight we had seen from the tamarisk tree,
And often sought
That Figure in the crowds, and often would see
Some one like Him, yet still it was not He.

Then, like all other days,
At last the great day came.—
We took our common ways,
And all things seemed the same;

No festal robe we wore,
No festal chant sang we,
We did not fast before
This great festivity.

The heavenly Temple wall
Stole round us unaware,
The heavenly festival,
Or ere we knew, was there.

Sad speech broke into singing,
Moonshine to clear sunshine,
The marriage bells were ringing,
The water turned to wine.

Jesus was there beside us. Radiant
He stood, talking with God, and saw no man,
Nor heard the wild fowl of the wilderness
Singing their Paschal songs. The Jordan ran
Unheeded at His feet.
Marvellously sweet
It was to stand there looking on the Face
Which made a holy temple of that desert place.

Withdrawn, entranced, motionless, unaware
Of the astonished crowd that gathered there,—
You would have said that on that river strand
God stood and talked with God: down the still air
Came floating murmured words, half psalm, half prayer:
"I did not see Thy naked Hand
Curve round this lamp which Thou had'st planned,
And trimmed, and filled; but, while I dreamed
In this fierce wilderness, it seemed
Thy kindling Hand upon me came,
And the full wick leapt into flame.
Now lighted by that flame I see
A world of seekers seeking Thee.
Blaze forth from this frail bowl of clay,
O Fire of God, and light their way!"

Called from this holy rapture by the sound
Of tramping feet, He wheeled abruptly round,
And gazed upon the wondering folk a space
In musing silence, the while every face
Sought His and waited; wistfully He gazed
Upon us all, then clear His voice upraised:
"Dawn, Redemption! Rise! Rise!
Lift up those stricken eyes!
Wilderness and dry parched land
Stir to feel the time at hand.
Soon instead of cold despair
The rose of joy will blossom there.
The night of grief was dark and long,
But fear not now, for with a song
God will come and save us; he
That hath eyes to see will see;
He that hath ears to hear will hear;
God's salvation draweth near.
Sing! and round your foreheads twine
Lilies and wild eglantine!

Sing! For you may turn away
From sin, and see God's Realm to-day,
You may turn away from sin
And come, to-day, and enter in!"

His voice was low; He did not strive nor cry:
Its modulations mingled musically
With the low melody
Of Jordan's many waters, yet rang clear.
And many folk were gathering here;
Even the Baptist had forsaken
His rocky pulpit, and come down the stream,
And now he stood like one but half awaken,
Or like one in a waking dream.
It seemed he did not hear
The Stranger's words so much as mark His mien.
"Where has He been,"
I heard him murmur, "all those forty days?
And what new marks are these engraven on His face,
As though He had been wrestling in some fearful place?"

Just then a bleating flock of lambs we spied
Upon the road, bound for the Holy City—
It was the Paschal season;—with sudden pity
Foreign to his stern speech John cried,
"Poor little lambs, soon to be tied
Upon the altar, you know not
Your sacred and mysterious lot!
And yet I hear a prophecy
In that sad, pleading, human cry."

Amazèd we stood by,
Marvelling to see that shaggy countenance
So charmed and softened suddenly, the while
His soul from her clear windows forth did glance,
And pause, and smile:
Amazèd too we heard
The harsh voice, that of late had rasped and whirred
Like thirsty grasshoppers in withered grass,
Thrill like the first notes of some April bird
Who sees her sweet mate pass.
And even as he spoke of sacrifice
The Baptist's eyes
Drawn by a heavenly magnet, turned
From gazing on the Paschal lambs to gaze
On Jesus' face.

As we watched, our hearts burned
To see those two. The Baptist all amaze
And tremulous; and Jesus' face full still,
Rapt far from earth. O yes, our hearts were stirred
By this high meeting: so beneath the hill
The small tarn stirs to feel a stray breath move
From the great winds that sweep the heights above.

And when we two lads heard
And saw these things, there woke
In us a need to be
With Jesus: each his cloak
And staff without a word
Took up and went. When He
Heard us He half turned and said,
"Children, what seek ye?"
And faltering I began: "Master, may we
Know where you lay your head?"
O, how dared I? . . .
Perhaps I heard some cry.
From the deep vastness of my spirit's home
Bidding my wandering self welcome;
Yet ere the words were out
He turned full round about
With joyful invitation, "Come and see!"
So we went with Him,
Found Him dwelling in a dim
Cave close by Jordan's side,
And stayed with Him till eventide.

At dusk there came a Pharisee
And greeted Jesus courteously;
Gnarled and grey and bent was he,
Like an ancient sea-blown tree;
And by his stoop, and wild, thin, silver hair
We recognized
The wavering priest who late had lagged behind
As if he had a mind
To be baptized.
"Ten of us," he said, "were sent to John
To ask him if he were the Chosen One,
And John said, 'Nay,'
But, as I turned away,
Whispered, 'Yet He is near';
And I came here,

I hardly can say why . . .
Rabbi . . . Rabbi . . .
Thou surely art a Teacher sent from God, and I
Desire to see God's Kingdom ere I die."

Grief was writ on his face,
An old parched face that shook
Like Autumn's latest leaf upon the tree;
And Jesus took
A towel and cool water and kneeled,—while we
Stood by ashamed,—and washed his feet,
And brought him food to eat,
And then said, "He who thinks to see
The things you now desire to see
Must turn and be a little child again."

Ah, what pain
In the old man's answering cry:
"How can I,
Grown old and dry
In teaching others, now put all that by
And send myself to school?
No, no, impossible!
We are all children once, then never any more;
Who can return through that irrevocable door?"

He paused, and moaned, and gasped for breath;
And Jesus, musing, made reply:
"If flesh and blood span life and death,
We are once born and once we die.
But what is this that comes and goes
About the paths of every day?
Or faint or clear, or grave or gay,
I hear a magic breath that blows
Musically from far away.
Whither it goes, whence it hath come,
We know as little as we know
From whence this vagrant breeze doth blow
(See how it stirs the vines that roam
Along our roof); yet it has come—
This we are sure,—has come from home,
Stirring within a home-sick heart,
Till all other desires depart
Save this insatiable pain
Of longing to be home again,
Then whispering, 'Wake, dear heart, and see,
Thou art at home who art in Me.'—

He is not born who doth descry
Things seen alone, nor can he die
Who has put by his blinding sin
And seen God's Realm, and entered in.
Have you not known these things as well
As I ? Are you not Principal
Of Beth-ha-Midrash ? Do not you,
Nicodemus, know this true :
Man must die and be born again,
Or else he will have lived in vain ? "

We could not tarry, for the old man wept ;
So softly forth we crept
Beneath the rustling vine.
Ah, water after wine
The pale moonshine on Jordan's streams
After the dazzling beams
We had beheld ; for we
Beheld strange glory there.
Jesus had bid us, Come and see ;
And there we saw, beyond our holiest dreams,
A veil withdrawn, and grace and truth laid bare.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.
JAMES ALEX. ROBERTSON.

## "*SOME NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS.*"

IF the letters of St. Paul are only fragments at best, and do not, therefore, either proffer or present a system of doctrine, or a system of ethics, or any system at all in the modern sense, save only that, perchance, of the "new creation" (2 Cor. v. 17) "growing up in all things into him who is the head" (Eph. iv. 15), the gospels, even more than they, are fragments, and cannot gratify the modern hunger for development in their respective narratives of Jesus. But just as it is almost inevitable that thinking men should go to the letters of the apostle to seek or find some traces of advance, some inklings of order and connexion in the

master-thoughts which filled his mind and fired his noble life, so they will search the gospels through for whatever may serve as a goodly clue to the growth of Jesus' life and teaching. And all the more, as one may think, since of all the ways that lead to the things of God, it is felt that the nearest of approach by far is that of the process and the poetry of growth. If it be the truth that "all things have been delivered unto me of my Father," it will help towards the knowledge and acknowledgment of the same if it can be shown "in little" if not "in much" that they were delivered gradually, or as He learned amid His own experience of the things of life. For the things of God, are they not just the things of life that are known, and have come to light? (Luke viii. 17.) The most convincing evidence of the magnitude of Jesus will not be found to lie in speculative views about His pre-existence, and the like, but mainly in the facts of His recorded life upon the earth which help to lighten up the truth that "He advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." This is an invaluable glimpse on the part of the writer of the third Gospel which, though referring as it does to the initial stage, may be taken to refer to the sequel as a whole. That St. Luke in setting out to write his gospel had caught a glimpse of the same in relation to the whole and not merely to the part is implied in his preface by the method which he there adopts. Using the remarkable word, *παρηκολουθηκότι*, "having investigated," which is the only instance of the word in this sense in the New Testament, though it bears the same sense, it would seem, in the papyri,[1] he points out that his method is one of full and accurate research with a view to the production of a narrative different to any heretofore in the sense of its being a connected story to the

[1] See *Oxford Studies*, p. 355, and cp. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. II, pp. 501–2.

end of the actual progress of events. As such it may be said to be prophetic in its way of the historic method as it has now come to be known, and some, on this account, regard St. Luke as a great historian, while others, judging the matter of his Gospel by the method, find that it fails of the ordered sequence which he claims for it. But the important point is not that the Evangelist fails to follow up his method step by step in modern style, but that he has lit upon a guiding principle in dealing with his data written and not written alike, and proceeds to compose his " treatise " in accord therewith. Even if it be but a glimpse, and rather points to sequence than provides it, still it is a glimpse caught by one of the first Evangelists of law and order in the things of history, analogous to that existing in the sphere of nature. And it falls to every seeker after truth to-day to follow his gleam, and retrace perchance with something more of that attention to detail which befits the modern mind, the stages in the growth of the mind and mission of our Lord. By suggestion here, and conjecture there, and by one and another attempting to think the relevant things together, the body of knowledge is bound to make increase. And that is as much as can be hoped for in a region where the facts are few relatively to their endless interest and appeal.

Now a slight attempt was made on the lines of the Lukan principle to fill in some of the details which bear upon the truth that " Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour (or approval) with God and men."[1] The more rational that truth becomes by virtue of every little glint of added light, it becomes more real. And the person Himself to whom it applies more real. Which is of the first importance considering the mists of futile fancy and of flimsy doctrine which have obscured His person age by age.

[1] Reference may be made to EXPOSITOR, July, 1921.

It is a comprehensive statement implying that the growth of Jesus was a normal growth affecting every phase or factor of His being, physical as well as intellectual, and moral and spiritual alike. That He advanced in *χάρις*, which here retains its earlier shade of meaning, is emphatic as to the expansion of His inner life. And if we choose to note the figure buried in the word *προέκοπτεν*, which is that of a pioneer cutting his way through brush-wood, we may reasonably infer that the whole process within and without was one in which the whole man was actively engaged. That this is the meaning of the term is shown by its corresponding use in Galatians i. 14, where the apostle says, "and I was advancing in the religion of the Jews beyond many who were of equal age with me in my nation, being more exceedingly zealous than they of the traditions of my fathers." He is referring, "as Philippians iii. 5, 6, would suggest, especially to the achievement of righteousness according to the standards and ideals of Pharisaism. His progress, he adds, not only carried him beyond his own former attainments, but by it he outstripped many of his contemporaries, making more rapid progress than they."[1] As to the progress of Jesus by which He achieved a righteousness which exceeded that of the Pharisees, we are not left without witness when we gather up the few related facts, and let their light fall backward on His early years. It is a light in which much that was hidden is disclosed (Mark iv. 22), and Jesus appears as one who was in the home and of it both, going in and out as others of His kin, and neither so aloof nor lonely or absorbed as to arouse their wonder or offence. The thoughts that afterwards became the marrow of His "new teaching with authority" (Mark i. 27) must have been growing into form as into fire the while He lived and laboured in their midst, and yet

[1] *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Burton, p. 46.

He had never "stood up" to preach, and was not known as one who had aught in particular to say or do. Judging by what it cost Him to renounce the home (Luke xiv. 26), we cannot but surmise that Jesus had reasons deep and vital as Himself for continuing to be subject to His parents, and that within its "enchanted door" He advanced in the wisdom of "these things" which are all of God and are revealed "to babes."

> "Le cœur a ses raisons
> Que la raison ne connaît point."

It is not possible to over-rate the influence of the home at Nazareth, and of the long protracted training there in the art of losing life to find it, upon the growth of Jesus' mind and spirit. That in the finding of His life He was impelled at length to leave the home, and that this became a cause of stumbling to His brethren shortly afterwards, permit us to infer that He had been as much at home within the home as they, and had come through the inevitable clash of differing temperaments and tastes without the loss of their affection or esteem, without, also, the gain of the kind of sense or prescience on their part which would have led them on to believe in Him. The term with which they blurted out their blank amazement, *Ἐξέστη*, "He is out of His senses" (Mark iii. 21), affords a startling glimpse, like a lightning-flash, of the contrast past their finding out, betwixt the simple quiet of His private life and the dæmonic passion and preoccupation of His public life. If their attitude to Him was one of such confusion and dismay, showing both how little they expected what they heard of Him, and how much He had been just as one of them before, His attitude to them was that of one Who was "in one mind," and Who had made the one and only choice He could have made despite the consequences to Himself.

The pain that throbs in the words of His renouncement of the home,

> "If any man cometh unto me,
> and hateth not his own father and mother . . .
> he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 26),

tells of the "abysmal deeps" of love which He had sounded in the home, and in which He had lived and moved a length of days, till "every power" advancing to a "double power" He was ready for the inception of His mission. A mission so unique as His, with its mighty trust and task, could not have found Him so matured within, and ripe to accomplish it without, had it not been for the long intensive culture of the home. He had already made an infinite number of choices there, all in the line of, and leading up to the final choice which swept Him forth to His ministry. Such a blazing-out of elemental thought and action in the open reveals the hidden fires which were akindle and aglow within Him all the while. The one recorded word of "wisdom" which came like the "light of fire" to His lips in the temple is enough to show the path upon which His mind and will were set from the first. And wisdom rare as this must needs have met with something more or less congenial in the environment to account for both the patience and the hope which held Him subject to His parents. In quietness and in confidence lay His gathering strength.

Now if one of the earliest events of His career—that of the frenzied visit of His mother and brethren (Mark iii. 20, 21)—helps to unveil the kind of life which He had lived in Nazareth, a life so quiet, unpretentious and at one with others there, that failing to divine the hidden thing of God in their midst, they were one and all confounded by the contradiction between His public life and His private life among themselves; another early event, that of the Temptation,

makes it certain that His life anterior to this was not untempted or untried, but shared like every other in the common lot of moral choice. While there is not a single glint of evidence in any of the sources that points directly to the manner of temptation which beset Him in the home, there are later indications which by throwing back their light may partially disclose it. It is possible, no doubt, to read too much into the one event that breaks the silence of His youth, but even of this may we not adventure the remark in this connexion that to one already so conspicuously wise and happy and at home in the "holy courts," it would be no "light thing" to have to leave His Father's house, and betake Himself again to the house of His parents? What that would mean to Him in whose heart, if in any, were the highways to Zion, thus early reaching out, as it were, to the "top of His bent," we may but dimly apprehend. But if in a later day He once spoke of being "hemmed in" or "limited until it be accomplished" (Luke xii. 50), may we not surmise that from the time of His going up to the Temple He would be conscious of a certain limit set upon His powers, and that it would be no small part of the wisdom in which he advanced to accept the limit and

"Turn His necessity to glorious gain"?

"It is in limitation that the Master shows himself," said Goethe, and of this there is ample illustration in the course of Jesus' public life; but may He not have had some foretaste of the same within the home? Unless we are simply to pass over the long spell of years in Nazareth as merely passive, or if not that then as subject to a kind of growth that cannot be appraised by human standards, we must think of it as under laws which involved Him, like the rest of men, in real tension both of mind and will. In other words, we must be in earnest with the master principle of

growth, and apply it through and through, or not at all. Only thus can we satisfy the "sense of fact."

Now, if we may take it there was something of the nature of a set-back to Jesus in His going down to Nazareth after the transports of His pilgrimage, it would be the beginning of another stage of the process of self-discipline, or of losing life to find it, through which He passed in His subjection to His parents. And we cannot conceive of this apart from the stress of "various trials," which He would fall in with "daily" (*καθ' ἡμέραν*, Luke ix. 23), "counting it all joy," as the apostle puts it in a passage in which he goes on to say that what is genuine in faith produces endurance, and it becomes endurance to be a finished product (that ye may be finished, and complete, lacking in nothing) (Jas. i. 2–4). Following certain data in His public life in which the hidden comes to light (Mark iv. 22), we ventured to refer to some of the likely trials which befell Him in the home, and which by "greeting with a cheer" He bereft of their bad influence and their good received, converting them into the means of the increasing wholeness of His soul.

> "Even more pure
> As tempted more; more able to endure,
> As more exposed to suffering and distress;
> Thence also, more alive to tenderness."

And to joy, as one may add. To greet it as pure joy to encounter trial and control it is one of those new elements of Christian truth which we owe to the finished product of our Lord's endurance. And of a truth so central to His word and will, it is not too much to say that it began to witness early in His life, from the time, at least, of His enchantment in the Temple and His first enraptured words:

> "Wist ye not that I had to be in my Father's house?"

It belongs to the newness of Jesus' thought of God that

He breathes the note of joy into the name of Father. It rises to His lips out of the heart's abundance (Luke vi. 45). As such it is not " a characteristically Jewish doctrine " so much as a characteristically joyous doctrine, and it grew in Him not merely as a doctrine but a *δύναμις* by virtue of the things which taught him to obey and to believe.

It is, surely, to ignore the creative significance of Jesus to identify the central thought or thing in Him with ordinary Jewish doctrine, and if it be objected that to find the central thing or thought so early as in the first recorded language of His lips is to ignore His growth, and transfer the end to the beginning, it may be answered that there is evidence enough in other lives to show that what emerges in the process, or as the product of a lifelong growth, starts out upon its destined path from just such a vital and authentic moment as that of Jesus' visit to the temple. There are early drawings of the painters and verses of the poets and strains of music which contain not merely a faint foreshadowing, but the actual performance in some measure of what in later years becomes endowed with but a fuller form, and that finished touch which makes their work their own, and their contribution to posterity. It would seem as if the masters were born with an appointed thing to say or do, and that they, or some of them at least, lit upon it even from the dawn of conscious thought, from some such " visionary hour " as that of Jesus spellbound in His Father's house. It is only in keeping, therefore, with the impulse or the law of growth as it works in the many that Jesus " at that season " should have thrilled with joy, as we are told He did at a later season (Luke x. 21), and should have given voice to the elemental truth or spirit which it was delivered unto Him to manifest and mediate to men.

It may be briefly noted here that to say that this spirit

which one may attempt to describe as a spirit of joyous and adoring trust or love towards the Father, and which is more than any doctrine, be it Jewish or even Christian, is the creative gift of Jesus to the world, is confirmed by the experience of Paul. For he declares not only that "if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His," but also that "the spirit which you have received is not the old servitude producing fear: it is a spirit of adopted sons, which inspires the cry (ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν), Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15); and, further, that "it is because you are sons that God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying (κρᾶζον), "Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6). "Though the word κρᾶζον itself conveys no suggestion of joy, it can hardly be doubted," says Burton, "that the intensity which the word reflects is in this case to be conceived of as the intensity of joy." It is the new sense or soul of sonship become articulate. It is the spontaneous and befitting utterance of a state or attitude so instinct with freedom and with faith that only the fiat of creation could account for it (2 Cor. v. 17)—that state in which "instead of looking upon God as lawgiver in the spirit of bondage and fear, He becomes to us Father with whom we live in fellowship as His sons." Surely a striking proof of the insight of the apostle into the essentially new, creative spirit of Jesus that he should find there, first and foremost, that which evokes the ringing cry of joy, "Abba, Father"; "deep calling unto deep."

But significant as is the witness of St. Paul to the newness of the spirit of Jesus, even more significant is that other witness of the same which appears in the evangelic records themselves, and in what they combine to tell of the mutual life and ministry of Jesus and the Baptist. For of all the influences which wrought upon Jesus, and left their mark on His development, we must place the influence of John

as among the first, if not itself the first. We have ventured to suggest and partially show that Jesus was neither so aloof nor lonely or apart as to be in the home, but not of it, and that the home was in every sense a potent factor in the expansion of those very principles and powers which led Him in the end to leave it. If there were other influences than those proceeding from the home, there is not a word to tell until we come to John. But with John we have to reckon with a personality whose influence on Jesus it is impossible to doubt or minimise, however hard it be to estimate aright. For if Jesus, as our records show, had so profound a sense of the unearthly origin and calling of the Baptist as to reason from that, or expect others to reason from that conclusively to His own unearthly source and destiny, we have in this a fact of the first importance which serves to unveil their kinship, or at least their close connexion in the affairs alike of earth and heaven. It is true that as we examine the connexion we find a contrast, too, and even a cleavage as strongly marked as the connexion, the emergence of which may well have been a signal factor in the growth of Jesus. But this, so far from tending to obscure, is fitted rather to display the incomparable rôle which John performed throughout His whole career. That two such personalities should meet together at the same appointed period of time and upon the same historic spot of earth and witness to each other as they do, is one of those unique phenomena which enhance one's sense of being in contact with historic truth. And the problem is as far as possible to sift out the truth that lies aback of this supreme event, and accounts for it.

Now, the very fact that John is present in the foreground of " the fulness of the time " is enough to make him great, even if there had been nothing more than that. But it is not merely his so fortunate appearance in the lustre of the

dawn (Luke i. 78) that gives him prominence as if he had naught within himself to bring. He shines with no mere splendour borrowed from another, mightier as that Other is, but first of all by virtue of his own renown, like Moses and Elijah on the mount. And in speaking about John from time to time, Jesus recognised and emphasised his great position and achievement; "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist" (Matt. xi. 11); "a prophet, and much more than a prophet" (Matt. xi. 9; Luke vii. 26). Even for Jesus, with His genius of appreciation, these words are words by themselves. And since He never used such language of outspoken eulogy without cause (cf. Matt. viii. 10; Matt. xv. 28; Mark xiv. 6), it proves that He had come to know John as the one man who was worthy of it. It beseemed him of whom it was said as well as Him who said it. Whether His knowledge dates from an earlier or from a later time, it could only have passed into finished utterance like this after long and rapt reflection on the man and on his work. It is inextricably interwoven with His own reflection on Himself. And seeing that He was Himself, if one might so express it, the eye and prospect of His own development, it is not unreasonable to infer that His knowledge of John went hand in hand with His knowledge of self, and grew with its growth. Granted that Jesus advanced in understanding of Himself by virtue of His intense attraction to and belief in John, the one alone of all His contemporaries who impressed Him deeply, may it not also be granted, almost of necessity, that they had met, and looked upon each other as they walked, and mingled in each other's life before the crisis of the Baptism?

Now if we may refer to Luke's account of the family ties which bound them, which may not all be fancy destitute of fact, we find a hint at least of earlier acquaintance, if not

of comradeship, prepared for them. "And Mary arose in these days and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Judah; and entered into the house of Zacharias and saluted Elizabeth" (i. 39–56). Of this district one has said that it is "perhaps more rugged and barren than any part of Palestine; is—as it must always have been—a wild and desolate moorland, where you may ride for hours without seeing a human being except maybe a solitary shepherd with his flock, and without hearing a sound except the call of the partridge on the hillside." [1] Possessing a "certain austere attraction which is all its own," the hill country of Judah, as it proved, was meet nurse for a prophetic child. For it was here, notably, that Amos spent his life and the summons came to him, "Go, prophesy unto My people Israel" (vii. 15). And how much the scene engrossed him as well as the summons is found in the native imagery of his thought and speech. Now, it was in the same lonesome and secluded land that the later prophet, too, was born and bred, "the pioneer of a new dispensation" like Amos, and whose ministry had much in common with the ministry of Amos. "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the wilderness till the day of his shewing (or proclamation) unto Israel" (Luke i. 80).

But while both alike were children of the wild, their minds attuned to its solitude, to its sights and sounds no less than to its stillness, they were wholly different to those who pass into the silent life and leave human wrongs to right themselves. Amos was "well versed in the moral and social conditions of the land of Israel as a whole, and in the outside movements in the wider political world." And if there is the old prophetic fire in his message, flashing and falling upon the sins which were ripe for judgement, there is the new and unfamiliar tongue of flame in it as well, that

[1] *The Gospel in the Old Testament*, Burney, p. 97.

Jehovah is not bound to Israel alone, but is supreme in history and sovereign over all mankind.

> "You only have I known of all the families of the earth . . . *therefore* I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (iii. 2).

And again, with the same thought burning in his heart—for who can but prophesy, the Lord Jehovah having spoken?—he presses home the question:

> "Wherefore do ye desire the Day of Jehovah?
> Is not the Day of Jehovah darkness and not light?
> Even deep gloom, and no brightness in it? (v. 18–20).

Now John, like Amos, beholding his time "at close quarters," was equally awake to and aware of the situation within and without, and especially of the sins which were rife as of old in the land, and of the judgement which must needs begin with the household of God (cp. 1 Pet. iv. 17). With the eagle eye of a man born to be a prophet he was able from his lonely watch-tower to survey the scene that lay so dark and ominous before him. One would fain draw nearer and learn a little, perchance, of how John came to know what he knew, and feel as he felt about the crisis which he discovered, and which discovered him there in the solitude, and which drove him at length to lift up his imperious voice "in all the region round about Jordan." No such voice had been heard for many an age in that land of voices, but it was appropriate to the man who was the one alone to see and sense the time and the hour. Amos being a herdman (Amos i. 1, vii. 14, 15) prior to his call, would doubtless travel to and fro the markets, and in other trysting-places would see for himself as a wayfaring man and men would,

> "Pour out the pack of matter to his ear
> The good and bad together."

But as regards John, the son of the priest, and his prolonged seclusion up to the sudden moment of his *ἀνάδειξις* our records are all but wholly silent, his silence falling as it

were like a spell upon them, and in only one of them is found the general statement, "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the wilderness till the day that he made his appearance before Israel" (Luke i. 80).

A brief summary like this in which it is sought to gather up his whole history previous and preparatory to his appearance suggests, no doubt, a great deal more than it says, but, in any case, there is little else than conjecture possible where the evidence that exists consists of but a series of fragments, and offers at most merely a glimpse or two of his epoch-making ministry. One thing, however, would seem to be clear, that John, even if or while he chose to remain in the wilderness, was no mere hermit loving the wilds rather than the world, intent on finding his salvation there, in utter detachment and alone. If he withdrew from society, it was not in any mood or from any motive of rebellious isolation. It was certainly not to close his ears or to shut his eyes to the gravity of the events which had long pursued their evil course, and were now, because of the crisis fast approaching, about to call him to the front no less instructed than equipped to cope with them as they required. The wilderness to John, so far from being an empty silence broken only now and then by

"The babbling gossip of the air,"

was like some spacious hollow in the hills filled with the murmurings of winds and many waters. It was a speaking silence that inclined his ear to hear the voices both of earth and heaven. It suited as well as served the uncommon powers with which he was endowed, and which could not have grown so strong in any other state. It helped especially, as one may think, to expand that signal gift which seems to have belonged to some if not to all the prophets, and which may be described as clair-audience. The truth is, however we may explain it, that this extraordinary man

who had found a home and a holy place in the wilderness, had come to hear what he heard and know what he knew by other than the channels common to experience. This is borne out by what we are expressly told in Luke iii. 2, that "the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness," for ῥῆμα means a spoken word, an utterance by which some thing or thought is divinely communicated, and ἐγένετο points to more than one communication, as in the corresponding phrase in Jeremiah i. 2. It may, therefore, be inferred that before the word of God came finally, and thrust him forth and forward to his mission, John had received a long and searching discipline by which he grew in the knowledge of the word both as spoken to the prophets and directly to himself, and which planted him in the thin red line of his brethren (Rev. xxii. 9), those holy men of God who spoke when they were carried away by the holy Spirit (2 Pet. i. 21). Something, then, it is certain, had driven him into the wilderness at the first, some breathing from above to which he could not hide his ear, and which kept him there, and gave him understanding, and when the moment came to which Heaven had joined great issues, swept him along as upon the wings of the wind to his appointed task. JAMES ROBERTSON CAMERON.

*(To be concluded.)*

## *THE FERGUSON HERESY CASE.*

### A PAGE IN SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY.

### I.

THE Rev. Fergus Ferguson, D.D., the hero of this Case, had probably a longer and more varied experience of ecclesiastical prosecution than any other Scottish Presbyterian clergyman, and his name was at one time famous throughout his country. But the river of years is a stream of forgetfulness, and few even in Scotland could tell us to-day who

Fergus Ferguson was or what was the work he accomplished. Although, therefore, this article is concerned only with one aspect of this man's career it is well to introduce it with a brief statement of biographical facts. Ferguson, as his name indicates, was of Highland descent, but he was a native of Glasgow, where he was born in 1832. In his youth he entered upon a commercial career; but he soon abandoned it, under the influence of Dr. John Ker, and devoted himself to the ministry of the United Presbyterian Church. At Glasgow University he distinguished himself especially as a student of philosophy and of Hebrew; he received his theological training at the Divinity Hall of his own denomination, and he was ordained at Dalkeith in 1864. During his ministry in that town he had, as we shall see, certain times of storm and stress; and he was accused of heresy in 1871. In '75 he was called to the pastorate of Queen's Park, Glasgow, where he soon established a powerful and devoted congregation and exercised a profound influence over a very intelligent community. In '76 he inaugurated a movement for the Revision of the Creed, and the years '77–'78 witnessed the great ecclesiastical Trial which is the proper subject of the following pages. In section II. of this paper his opinions are briefly set forth, and it is there shown that the main ground of his prosecution was a Universalistic doctrine of ultimate destiny, associated with a speculative theory of the Atonement which in some respects resembled that of Macleod Campbell. It may be added here that he received his Doctorate from Glasgow University in 1884, and that in '90 he refused nomination to a theological Chair. He died at West Kilbride in 1911.

Huxley remarks somewhere that cold controversy makes an unappetising dish: a characteristic and shrewd saying. Nevertheless, history is largely a record of past controversy, political, social, philosophical, religious; nor is history,

on that account, a cold or unappetising study. The truth is that the fortunes of the world go on their way through conflict, and faith renews itself in battle. Especially does the Church, in all its branches, advance in knowledge and understanding through oppositions within itself, by the constant action and re-action upon each other of liberty and authority, of individual thought and corporate tradition. And the story of the ecclesiastical conflicts that thus arise is never without its interest. So far from being unattractive, it has perpetual allurement. It supplies the element of colour and movement, of risk and adventure, in the annals of religious thought. Also, it has for its meaning the things that really matter in the world: the chivalry that marches under the banner of hope and lives in the light of ideas, the vision that sees and the courage that follows the gleam, the forces of faith which remove the things that are shaken so that the things which cannot be shaken may remain. Nor is the interest and significance of past controversy in the least lessened when, as in the Case at present in view, the scene of battle is a small nation like the Scottish and a small society like one of the sections of a divided Presbyterianism. The importance of a drama does not depend on the size of the stage on which it is presented. And, whatever the scale on which a conflict may be waged, it must always be of moment if it is worthily fought and if the questions at issue concern such high matters as Incarnation and Atonement and the Destinies of mankind.

We are very ecclesiastical in Scotland; and one result of this is that movements of thought are long in producing much visible effect in the region of faith and worship. All highly organised Churches are the trustees of much inherited wealth in the form of religious tradition, and like all good trustees they guard their treasure with care. Every attempt

to add to that treasure is jealously scrutinised lest it should in effect impoverish it. Moreover, the machinery of the Presbyterian order is elaborate and massive, designed for safety and strength rather than swiftness of movement. It is not easily set to work for the accomplishment of change, and after it has begun to act it proceeds with great deliberation. Also, its results in the end are apt to be inconclusive in form and to have little force in their immediate effect. When ecclesiastical Courts condemn a man or a movement they generally express themselves in such a way that a measure of progress is really secured; and when, on the other hand, they acquit one who is charged with heresy their habit is, at the same time, to admonish and caution him. The truth is that their decisions are as a rule modified by considerations of policy and by influences that are not purely theological; they have no inspiring or leading power; they never originate anything, but only recognise, with more or less unwillingness, that a certain type of thought has established itself in the Church. Perhaps the most notable feature of them, however, is that they nearly always have for their final result the enlargement of freedom. Thus, the deposition of John McLeod Campbell strengthened the advanced party within the Church of Scotland; the blundering condemnation of James Morison had far-reaching effects in the quickening of thought regarding the Atonement; Robertson Smith's dismissal from his chair stimulated the critical movement; and the discussion and the judgment in the Ferguson Case marked the beginning of a new era of theological fertility in the United Presbyterian Church.

Heretics have very often been men of engaging personality, and certainly Fergus Ferguson was singularly prepossessing in appearance, in mind and in character. He had a most winning grace and courtesy of manner, and was able to

inspire an almost romantic affection for himself in the minds especially of younger men. He retained almost to the end of a long life an aspect of youthfulness, so that even at the time of his trial when he was aged nearly fifty years he was commonly referred to by speakers as "our young brother." His countenance was, in its expression and cast of feature, both strong and comely; and his grey eyes looked out upon the world with a benevolent but keen regard. He was an excellent Hebrew scholar and had wide literary culture, but his mental habit was fundamentally metaphysical. Interested as he was in his fellow-men, widely human in his sympathy and tenacious in his friendships, he yet lived for the world of ideas; and whatever time was left him from the cares of a busy pastorate was devoted to continuous study. Profoundly influenced by Schelling and Hegel, he was also a close student of the mystics like Tauler, Boehme, Swedenborg and Law. Philosophy and theology thus were the engrossment of his entire career. Indeed, throughout his whole ministry, and on to extreme old age, he was constantly at work as he had opportunity in the composition of a book which was meant to set forth a complete system of truth. This book was often finished, and as often begun again; so anxious was he to achieve exactness of thought and language. Only a fragment of what was intended to be its final form was completed when, it being late evening, he was called to go home.

It may seem as if a theologian and scholar of Ferguson's type would have been very slow to engage in war. And certainly those who met him in social intercourse, or knew him only as a pastor, or listened to his beautiful and devout conduct of public worship, might easily have supposed him the most peaceful and least contentious of men. Nevertheless, he had in him qualities which were almost certain

in those days to involve a man in conflict. His intellect was speculative, restless and daring; he was absolutely direct in purpose; and he had a habit of turning ideas over and over in his mind until as he mused his imagination became afire and the necessity of utterance came upon him. At such a time he expressed himself in language which often attained a high degree of impassioned eloquence, and he spoke without the slightest thought of cost or fear of penalty. He never, indeed, lost self-control; but there was in his eye the gleam of steel, and there came into his musical voice a vibrant note of intense and stern conviction. In these prophetic moods he was a formidable force; for he possessed the gifts of a public speaker; his controversial skill was very great; his language virile, his sincerity manifest; and his dialectic was driven home by the weight of a powerful personality.

Such being the characteristics of the man it does not altogether surprise us that he became involved in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities. In any case, Ferguson was throughout the greater part of his active ministry engaged in continual debate. Ordained in '64, he had not been long minister at Dalkeith when he created a little tempest by the delivery from his own pulpit of a vigorous protest against the exaggerated homage which he thought was being paid to the memory of Robert Burns. He really said no more on that occasion than Stevenson did later, and far less than Henley; but he brought upon himself quite a clamour of denunciation, chief among his critics being the well-known George Gilfillan of Dundee. Nor is this to be wondered at; for whoever in Scotland utters a word in disparagement of Burns must expect to fare as if he had attacked the Covenanters. Nevertheless, the incident illustrates the moral courage and the indifference to popular laudation which were always distinctive of

Ferguson. Hardly had this trouble ended, also, than he was arraigned by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, being accused of speculation as to the Intermediate State and the fate of the heathen. Then began his experience of being examined and questioned and interviewed by committees of the Church Courts; an experience of which perhaps no man ever had so much, or liked it less. This first heresy Trial of his was begun and ended and begun again. Finally it was carried to the Synod, which required him to sign four propositions that were regarded by many as directly contradicting his own teaching. This, however, was not his own view; for the statement in which he signified his assent to the propositions mentioned concluded with the declaration: "I still hold all the interpretations of Scripture given by me from the pulpit, and understand that my liberty, as a minister of the Gospel, to speak according to my own light, conscience, and sense of responsibility, remains unimpaired." This was in '71; and it was in '76, barely two years after his induction to the pastorate of Queen's Park Church, Glasgow, that he became involved in the great Trial which was reported at length in all the Scottish newspapers and was not ignored by the London Press, by American theologians or even by the Olympian Germans. No coherent account of it has up to this time been written; its features have become an indistinct impression in the minds even of those who witnessed it; and the story of it has to be gathered with some labour from contemporary newspaper reports and pamphlets. None the less, it will demand the attention of the future historian; for it had its origins far back in earlier controversies as to the Atonement, it was vitally related to other heresy Cases of the nineteenth century, and it marked the emergence into light of forces which had for a long time been at work in the hidden thoughts of men.

It all began with an overture which Ferguson presented in Glasgow Presbytery praying the Synod to undertake the revision of the Creed. The speech in which he proposed the adoption of this overture was fitted to startle any Presbyterian Court of those days. Indeed no such arraignment of the Confession had ever before been heard within the Scottish Church. The Westminster symbol was attacked in its statement of every important article of belief; in its teaching as to God, the Universe, Man, Christ, the Church and the Scriptures. Its doctrine of the Trinity was alleged to be "tritheism on a basis of pantheism"; it was charged with giving no account of the Universe at all, in its nature, origin, or destiny; its account of Man was stated to be fatally defective, implying that fallen humanity had no spiritual part, but only body and soul, leaving it totally incapable of being redeemed. Similarly, the Confession's doctrine of Atonement was trenchantly criticised, as well as its view of the Church and the Bible. "I," said the speaker, "deliberately impeach the Confession." "It is out of harmony with the divine order of the Universe," and "is an exhibition rather, at least to some extent, of the disorder of the human intellect."

As was altogether to be expected, the Presbytery was seriously disturbed by this address; and subsequent speakers deplored it, though in differing degrees of condemnation and "in diverse tones" of sorrow. Further, the Court refused to accept the overture as submitted by Ferguson. It did, however, adopt a milder motion of its own, calling for a reconsideration of the Church's attitude towards the Confession of Faith; and the issue of this was that the Synod adopted a Declaratory Act which relaxed the terms of subscription to the Creed. This, again, led to similar steps being taken by other Presbyterian Communions; and so was secured an abiding good in the life of the Scottish

Church. Thus, the end sought by the prime mover in the matter was in some degree gained; but time was to show at what cost to Ferguson himself all this had been achieved. Indeed, he had hardly proposed his overture when there was given forewarning of the trouble to come. For an impetuous elder forthwith tabled a document which was nothing less than a formal libel, alleging that the minister of Queen's Park Congregation had uttered heretical doctrine, in his speech delivered that day, and calling for his immediate trial.

## II.

At this point it may be well to ask what the trouble was all about. The answer to this question is not, as some writers have supposed, that the Ferguson Trial was a case of much ado about nothing; that the accused was really a most orthodox man whose contentions, in a more enlightened community than the United Presbyterian Kirk, would have attracted small attention. This view of the matter implies that men like Dr. John Cairns and Dr. Ker and Dr. Calderwood did not know what the Calvinistic theology was, and were unable to tell whether or no a man was really at one with it. Further, it is forgotten that Fergus Ferguson never professed to be orthodox according to the standards of the Church. He was openly at war with these standards and was careful to claim only that he was "in profound and immovable agreement with the catholic faith of Christendom." It is not, of course, to be denied that the arraignment of this Christian thinker was a mistake, though it may be described as, in the circumstances, an unavoidable mistake, and a necessary incident in the development of freedom. But it certainly would be an error to say that Ferguson's system of religious thought was in agreement with the traditional theology of the

Presbyterian Church. The truth of this will appear if we recall briefly what his main positions were.

His doctrine of *God* was very elaborately wrought, resting on a mystical type of philosophy, and cannot be expounded here in its entirety. It may be said, however, that he held the divine existence to be implied in the very nature of thought, thus adopting a form of the Ontological Argument. He taught that God, "the absolutely Good One," "held within Himself the idea of Himself, and was able to utter it in a word" and that He existed "in three forms of absolute self-manifestation, called in Scripture the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." This latter statement, as to the Trinity, did not, however, imply a merely modal type of doctrine. For "self-manifestation" meant in Ferguson's language personal existence. God was conscious of Himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and it was only as thus self-conscious that He was knowable by man. God, as Father or as Son or as Holy Spirit was "personal but not a person." He was a person only in the fulness of His threefold life.

The *Universe*, "the totality of things regarded as a unity," is the creation of God; but ideally it has neither beginning nor end inasmuch as it is the expression of the eternal thought of its maker. It was not created "out of nothing," for nothing is "that of which we can form no notion"; it was created out of the idea of it pre-existent in the divine mind. The act of creation is, therefore, no more mysterious than the translation of thought into language. The universe is the language in which is uttered and set forth the being and character of God, and also that law of life in obedience to which unfallen man was meant to fulfil himself and secure his blessedness.

It was in his doctrine of *Man* that Ferguson departed most decisively from Calvinism, and it is in this that we

must find the root of his alleged heresies. Man, in his threefold constitution of body, soul, and spirit, corresponds to the tri-unity of God, and it is only in the combination of these that he is a complete personality. The body is in itself purely passive, the necessary organ of soul and spirit. The soul is specifically mind; the spirit is distinctively will, and pervades soul and body, making them one and completing the synthesis which is the human creature. The spirit is an impartation of God, "is indeed identical with God," and so forms the connecting link with the Creator, and the means whereby the creature is sustained in its distinctive existence. The withdrawal of the spirit would mean the dissolution of personality.

Now, the theological consequences of this view of man's nature are evident. It led Ferguson to deny, for instance, that sin had so corrupted man's being as to render him depraved in all his powers and faculties, and incapable of good works "such as do accompany salvation," or of co-operating in his own redemption. The inalienable characteristic of man's spiritual part is spontaneity, freedom of will. To say, therefore, that man is no longer free is to say that he is no longer spirit but only soul and body, thus reducing him to the level of lower life. Hence Ferguson, while he affirmed that sin was a perversion of the will and entailed alienation from God, liability to divine wrath and many other penalties, maintained that it did not destroy his power "to think correctly and act accordingly"; it did not end his natural relation to God or extinguish his power of choice. Sin was, however, a negative principle, utterly opposed to reality and to the Divine purpose, anarchic, destructive, deadly. Its logical end was, therefore, the dissolution of the whole universe as the expression of God's mind and intention, and the annihilation of the creature. If allowed to fulfil itself, it would

entail the withdrawal of the spirit: and that withdrawal would make an end of personality.

It was at this point that Ferguson found the universal efficacy of the *Atonement*. The death of Christ "satisfied the Divine justice as that which requires perfect submission to the will of God." But this perfect submission involved the endurance of the ultimate consequence of sin which was the withdrawal of the Spirit, separation from the Father, the dissolution of life. All this Christ voluntarily suffered on the Cross. Sin was there permitted to reveal its true nature and to work out its necessary end in that horror of darkness which fell upon the Redeemer and in the dissolution of His existence. Christ was enabled to endure this uttermost doom, which would have annihilated any mere creature, in virtue of His divine Sonship. The effect of this perfect sacrifice is that the fate of complete destruction no longer threatens any son of man. No one can perish as all men might have perished had Jesus not endured the Cross. There remain, however, the actual transgressions of men; and these find their atonement in the perpetual offering of intercession which the Saviour presents before God in eternity. This priestly oblation within the veil owes its power to the work accomplished on Calvary, and indeed is of that work the complete fruition, availing for the forgiveness of all iniquity. The only sin, therefore, that now really remains to be imputed to us is the unbelief which will not accept and trust the Redeemer.

The fulness of the redemption wrought in Christ will be made manifest in the future life. At death the spirit of every man returns to God, the body comes to dust, and the soul alone remains in the intermediate state. Hence the intermediate state is a condition of mere thought, of mental activity and nothing more. The soul there discerns the true meaning of the life which is past and is enabled

to judge itself. Christ is presented to it as He is. Those who have not known Him on the earth know Him there, and recognise that in their faithfulness or infidelity to the light given them they have implicitly accepted or rejected the Saviour. Those, on the other hand, who have become acquainted with the claims of Christ in this mortal state, but have not believed or obeyed, come to recognise the measure of their guilt, while believers learn to understand more fully the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. In the end comes the Consummation, when the whole human personality is re-integrated and restored, after an immortal likeness, in body, mind, and spirit. Ultimately, all men will attain to "a useful and tolerable existence," or to "the position which was occupied by man before the fall": all positive evil and suffering having an end. But only those who have been faithful in this world to the light that lighteneth every man will attain the fulness of the blessing of the Kingdom of God.

Such were, in brief outline, the main positions which brought Ferguson into conflict with his Church. It will be seen that the problem presented by the universal aspect of the Atonement troubled this "heretic" as it had troubled his predecessors, Macleod Campbell and James Morison. It is to be noted, too, that his solution resembled that of Campbell, who also maintained that Christ endured in death a trial which no mere creature could have borne. A further resemblance is to be found in the importance attached by both these thinkers to the intercessory element in the Saviour's work; though Campbell emphasised the priestly ministry of Christ on earth, while Ferguson dwelt on the idea of its perpetual continuance in eternity. It is to be observed, again, that Ferguson's unusual analysis of man's personality leads him to find some difficulty in distinguishing between the divine Spirit and the higher

element in human nature ; and it will be remembered that Philo confessed the same perplexity in expounding his doctrine of the Logos. On the whole, it is not surprising to find Principal Cairns declaring, in 1877, that Ferguson's system had not received the attention it required ; for it is undoubtedly the work of a mind possessed with the true philosophic desire " to think things together," and it reveals a fine determination to follow ideas to their logical conclusions and to secure a harmonious statement of truth. It was this characteristic which led Ferguson to deny the existence of two Covenants of God with man, and to assert that there was and could be only one covenant between the Creator and His creature, namely that which was written in the constitution of man and might be expressed in the words : " Be true to thyself and thou shalt be true to God." The same desire to exclude absolute oppositions inspired his insistence that all grace was law, and all law was grace, " streaming through eternity." In like manner, his curious doctrine of the Intermediate State follows logically from his teaching as to the constitution of the human being, and so does his theory of the restitution of all things. It is to his infinite credit that he was the first minister of any Presbyterian Church to face fairly the question of ultimate destiny, and that he presented a solution of that question which was organically related to a definite theory of Atonement and formed the consistent conclusion of a patiently reasoned process of thought.

## III.

But it is necessary now to return to the Presbytery of Glasgow. That reverend Court, in the autumn of '77, found itself a good deal perplexed. As already stated, an impulsive elder had, at the close of the first debate, tabled a kind of impromptu libel, accusing Fergus Ferguson of

various heresies and demanding his trial. This act of zeal was, however, unwelcome to the Presbytery, which directed the document to be laid on the table and to remain there till some future date, meanwhile forbidding its author to print or publish it. The elder, unfortunately, defied this order, and distributed his document in pamphlet form throughout the whole Church. Meantime the Synod met and, as the result mainly of the Glasgow Presbytery's overture, appointed a committee to consider the matter of Creed Revision: in this committee, also, by a special vote, it included Fergus Ferguson. The motion dealing with the question, which Principal Cairns submitted, contained, however, a somewhat severe judgment on the conduct of "the prime movers" in the matter. These prime movers were David Macrae of Gourock, who was afterwards expelled from the United Presbyterian Ministry on the ground of unorthodox opinions, and Fergus Ferguson of Queen's Park. The latter of these took this rebuke so much to heart that he intimated to his Session his intention of withdrawing from the Church: but this announcement caused such consternation among his people and evoked so many remonstrances from his friends that he agreed to refrain from action in the meantime and await the proceedings of the Presbytery.

When, therefore, the Presbytery met after the summer holidays of '77 its members were called to face a disturbing situation. One element in that situation was the disobedient elder who had flouted Church authority. A second element was the indictment of Ferguson, which was in theory lying on the table of the Court but was actually fleeting about the country doing mischief. But the third and most difficult feature in the case was the heretic himself. His brethren all respected him; he was one of their best preachers and most distinguished personalities; he was in

a resentful and restive mood, doubtful as to the line of duty and honour. Besides, the prospect of having to prosecute him for being out of harmony with the Confession was a peculiarly awkward one, in view of the fact that the Confession itself was on trial that year, with this accused man as one of its appointed judges. Moreover, Ferguson exercised a great deal of influence and commanded much popular sympathy. Indeed, there could be no doubt that many of the abler men among the clergy would feel their own position compromised if he were condemned. Altogether, it is easily to be seen that the Glasgow Presbytery had reason for anxious thought.

The course that was taken in these circumstances was characteristic of Presbyterian methods. The disobedient elder was rebuked; but gently, for Presbyteries are indulgent to elders. But the gentleman in question, being a lawyer, was not much impressed by ecclesiastical reproof. Indeed, he was reluctant to withdraw his libel, and was finally persuaded to do so only on the assurance that the Court would itself take up the case. The bargain thus made was hardly consistent with ecclesiastical dignity; but the hopes of the brethren were centred in methods of conciliation. The next step taken showed this; for a committee was appointed to consult with the accused and to seek in a friendly way to reason him into conformity. Unfortunately, however, Ferguson had been the victim of many committees during his former Trial, and had become wary of them. He had found that their proceedings meant a long process of arguing and persuading and cross-examining which ended in a man being so confused and tired that he was able to be bound and carried whither he would not. He therefore refused to meet the committee except on the basis of a written document, clearly stating the case against him. Such a document was, of course, found to be a difficult

thing to produce. And the end of it was that the accused agreed to answer questions drawn up by the committee, but to answer them only in open Court. The speech which he made in fulfilment of this promise was one of remarkable ability and power ; indeed, it is the equal of any statement ever made before a Scottish ecclesiastical court by a man suspected of heresy. It was supplemented, also, by a declaration of his own personal faith which might well have contented the Presbytery. The conservative party, however, was not satisfied, for feeling had become embittered ; and nothing was left for the accused but to demand a libel—that is to say, a regular trial on a definite indictment. This request the Presbytery could not refuse ; and so Fergus Ferguson was suspended from the exercise of his office, and the long and laborious process of an ecclesiastical impeachment began.

The charges of false teaching finally laid against him concerned the doctrines of Atonement, Justification, the two Covenants, the results of the Fall, the ground of Condemnation, and Future Punishment ; and on all these counts, except that as to the two Covenants, he was found guilty. We may conjecture that by the time this conclusion was reached Ferguson had ceased to look for a final verdict of acquittal. He, indeed, appealed to the Supreme Court ; but it is probable that he did this because he wished to see the matter to its end, rather than in the expectation of victory. It is certain, at least, that he went up to the Synod of '78 a tired and discouraged man. The proceedings before the Glasgow Presbytery had been long and wearisome, and he had borne the burden of the battle himself. It is true that he found a number of loyal friends and advocates, prominent among whom was the venerable Dr. Joseph Brown, who was able to remind the Court that he had proposed revision of the Creed in the year 1846.

But few of his supporters were in entire agreement with Ferguson's position; their general contention was simply that he was not at fundamental variance with the Church. Hence he had to rely in argument mainly on his own resources; and it was admitted by all that he fought each point of the libel with dignity, skill and courtesy. But the strain upon his spiritual and moral as well as his mental power was enormous. For, the atmosphere surrounding the Trial was tense and eager; the Press was unceasing in its watchful criticism; correspondence columns in the papers were filled with letters which were not free from the brutalities of popular debate; the audiences which crowded the Presbytery Hall were given to interrupt the proceedings with demonstrations of opinion; scenes in the Court itself were sometimes very dramatic; and, as is usual in such cases, some were found to charge the defender with dishonesty and unbelief. Meanwhile the Robertson Smith Case was arousing much excitement; David Macrae was giving his own Presbytery no rest from strife; and George Gilfillan was intermittently thundering from Dundee. All this was supremely distasteful to Ferguson, who shrank from publicity, disliked democratic methods, and had the temper of the mystic. Hence, he went to appear before the Synod wearied and disheartened; determined on one thing only, to withdraw nothing, to evade nothing, "having done all to stand."

To this determination he was faithful. When the Synod proceeded to discuss the first charge against him, which concerned the Atonement, he made a short statement explaining his position. It was a strange speech to be made by one who stood at the Bar, for it was uncontroversial in tone, mystical and abstract in character, curiously calm and aloof. To the majority of his hearers it made nothing clear except that Ferguson was Ferguson still. In any

case, the current of the debate set against him; for the leaders of the Church were hostile. To the man sitting at the Bar, with folded arms and bowed head, the trend of matters must have been apparent. James Orr, afterwards the celebrated Professor of Theology, however, took action which had important results. Just before the vote was taken he put questions to the defender which he well knew would be answered in an orthodox sense. The most important of these were whether Mr. Ferguson believed that Christ satisfied the justice of God "as that which required the punishment of sin," and whether he held that the sacrifice of the Saviour was "the ground of all forgiveness." Of course Ferguson answered these queries in the affirmative; even Macleod Campbell would have done that. Who, indeed, doubts that the justice of God requires the punishment of sin? Who that believes in Atonement will deny that it represents the ground of forgiveness? Certainly Ferguson had never questioned either of these opinions.

Mr. Orr's intervention did not, however, alter the issue of the vote, and the appeal was rejected by a large majority. But at this point Ferguson took a step that was not expected. Speaking clearly, respectfully and gently, though with strong emotion, he intimated that in view of this decision he would no longer defend his case. This meant that he proposed to withdraw from the Church; and its effect was electrical. His intimates crowded round him proffering their sympathy and encouragement; and practically all who had voted for him registered their dissent from the finding of the Court. As these included most of the abler men among the younger clergy, their action had a grave and even ominous aspect; and not a few of the onlookers believed that it heralded a time of trouble and disunion in the Church. Nor were such fears unfounded; for if Fergus Ferguson had suffered the extreme ecclesiastical penalty

the thoughts of many hearts would have been revealed. It was the prudent policy of the leaders which saved the situation. After the appellant had been formally found guilty on all the counts of the Libel, Professor Calderwood moved that judgment be deferred, and that a committee be appointed meantime to confer with their brother and report to the Synod. In supporting the motion he indicated that Mr. Ferguson's answers to Mr. Orr's questions had given reason for hope that an understanding might be reached. A private conference then took place, according to this arrangement; but what really happened at that conference was never made quite clear. However, the issue was that, after a very skilful speech by Dr. Calderwood, the Court agreed that Mr. Ferguson should be rebuked for some of his speculations, especially those relating to the doctrine of immortality, but that he should forthwith be restored to his ministerial charge. Thus the Case that had begun with a committee concluded with a committee; and the saying of Origen was illustrated: "The end shall be as the beginning."

It cannot be said that the result thus reached was either logical or satisfactory. It was certainly not pleasing to Ferguson, who continued for many years to be restless and ill-content, and kept reiterating from time to time his characteristic doctrines; nor was it to the mind of his opponents who vainly endeavoured to have the whole case re-opened. Nevertheless, the decision of the Synod was in harmony with the genius of a Church which always sought to combine general loyalty to the evangelical faith with a large measure of individual freedom; which had been compelled to bear the brunt of many controversial storms; which had a curious power of advancing while seeming to retreat, and of securing liberty while it asserted

authority. In any case, it is evident that Fergus Ferguson was in many respects a really great figure ; in mind subtle, profound, independent, facing every problem of thought with reverence and with hope ; in character devoted, fearless, honourable. His Case remains, in one of its aspects, the greatest of Scottish ecclesiastical Trials, inasmuch as it was concerned, not with one point of doctrine only or with matters of mere criticism, but with the whole range of Christian theology. By his sincerity, by the power of his personality and the timeliness of his action, he did a service to his Church and his country which was none the less real that it has been so little recognised. He failed, indeed, to bring about that thorough revision of the Creed for which he had hoped and fought ; and it was perhaps without complete success that he strove till the end of a long life to achieve a perfect harmony between the evangelical beliefs which were dear to his heart and the philosophy which possessed his mind. Nevertheless, he is to be numbered among those in all ages who have made the great Endeavour, and have staked their all on the adventure of thought, which is also the venture of faith. He beheld the vision of a religion perfectly reconciled with knowledge and reason ; he saw this vision, and by an austere and toilsome way he followed it, "and did not dream it was a dream." Hence it is that we owe to him, with others of greater renown, the emancipation and theological fruitfulness of later Scottish thought ; and his demand that the Church should reconcile its conscience with its Creed, and that the individual religious thinker should meet the ultimate questions unafraid, is a demand that remains to the present age an inspiration and a challenge.

J. H. Leckie.

## *THE BEGINNING OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.*

THE textual variations and the still more important difficulties of construction in the opening verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark are well known to students of the New Testament. It is therefore unnecessary to enumerate the various suggestions which have been advanced by critics and commentators as to the precise relationship between the introductory words *Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* [*υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ*] and the clause which follows, *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ* (*al. ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*). The fact that so much attention has been devoted to the problem shows the extent to which the difficulty has been felt.

It has, however, apparently escaped the notice of critics that another and simpler (but highly significant) solution of the whole question is possible. The clue to this is found in one of the commonly accepted facts relating to St. Mark's Gospel, viz., that the original ending is lost, and that its place has been supplied in two different ways, the longer of which has become the received text (xvi. 9–20). The complete loss of the original text at this point establishes one point of great importance, viz., that there was a stage in the history of the Gospels when only one copy of St. Mark's was available, and that in a defective state. If a second and perfect copy had been anywhere procurable, the genuine text of the closing portion would have been supplied from that source.

If this solitary copy was in the form of a roll, it must have lost its last column or columns ; if it was in the form of a codex, it had lost its last leaf or leaves. In a roll, however, the one end would be as liable as the other to be worn out or torn off, and in a codex the first and last leaves

run the same risk of becoming detached and lost. Those who have much acquaintance with manuscripts know how frequently both the beginning and end of a text have been lost in this way. If therefore this unique copy of Mark was in such a state that it was defective at the end, there is also a fair chance that it had suffered similarly at the beginning. This supposition would at once account for the difficulties which have been felt with regard to the present commencement. The text would begin defective with verse 2, the first verse being merely of the nature of a heading, and the natural way to indicate this would be by printing in this form :—

*Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

* * * *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ*, etc.

If this is the real solution of the problem, certain other features of the Gospel assume a different aspect, and more especially the first mention of Jesus in i. 9, in the words *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, etc. This mode of narration, which in the present state of the text is remarkably abrupt, would be quite natural if some account of Jesus had already been given. This, however, implies that much of the reasoning with regard to the nature of the primitive Gospel, based on the traditional text of St. Mark, ceases to have any secure foundation, as there are no means of determining what the contents of the lost beginning may have been.

If the actual mutilated copy of St. Mark was the one used by the collector or collectors of the Gospels, the defective state of the text must have been obvious, and it was possibly this consideration which decided the placing of Mark's narrative after Matthew's, in order to avoid beginning with an imperfect account. The abruptness of the opening was then (if not at an earlier stage) relieved by

the addition of the heading, which when taken in connexion with the following context served to disguise the absence of an essential part of the text.

W. A. Craigie.

## *THE PARABLES AND THE JOHANNINE PROBLEM.*

Why did the Lord Jesus teach in parables? Is it enough to say that it was natural to Him, that He thought in pictures, and therefore spoke in pictures? There is much to be said for this view. These parables are exquisite in their naturalness and freshness, perfect examples of the art which conceals art. Thought and symbol are most harmoniously wedded. Not once does the suspicion cross one's mind, "Here He is talking down to the people. He is putting into a story what would be better expressed in more theoretical form." On the contrary, the more one examines any of the greater parables—the Prodigal Son, for example—the more one is convinced that the picture of real life, the interplay of actual personalities, gives a revelation of the heart of God, a picture of reality, that is as inexhaustible as life itself. A definition must grow old and stale with time, because systems of philosophy and schools of logic become out of date. But the passing of the years can only give deeper richness of meaning to stories from actual life. It is almost probable that the parables were in some cases actually object lessons; He pointed to the sower scattering his seed on the path, on the stony ground, among the thorns, and on the good ground; He pointed to the "lilies of the field" as He told men to "consider" them; it was on the sea-shore that the parable of the drag-net was told. It has been suggested that in His own village He had known a father whose son, returning from a "far country" where he had "wasted his substance in riotous living," was received

with a kiss and "the fatted calf." The stories are concrete and real, the people in them are "drawn from the life," as men say. It was natural to Him to speak of God in human terms, and to see in natural objects and common things the vision of the Highest. It was because He was so human, more human than they were, that men began to think of Him as divine. It had been an incredible paradox if the Father in whom He Himself believed, who was the constant companion and context of all His thought and emotion, to whom He prayed, had been of a different quality. "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" is One about whom men learn as they see the shepherd going out to seek the lost sheep until he find it, or the father welcoming his lost son without even telling him, or anybody else, that he forgave his folly and his wickedness. One reads the stories of this greatest of the world's religious teachers, and He is telling of a man caught by robbers, and saved by a foreigner; of tenants carrying on a no-rent campaign, with violence and murder as their weapons; of a cow falling into a ditch. For Him, at least, the Divine and the Human are not mutually exclusive, the sacred and the secular are not opposed, the natural and the supernatural are continuous. It is significant that His religion is more human than official. His God is in everything, and everything is in God. The little birds are not far from Him, the leaven heaving in the dough is a picture of His inspiration, the most commonplace things remind Jesus of God. He is the sort of God whose Son you would expect to find wearing a workman's coat, and tramping the world with fishermen and peasants. In fact, so profoundly natural are the parables to our Lord that we can conceive no other method of teaching so fitting for one who was Incarnate God, and whose religion has always been profoundly incarnational and sacramental.

It was suggested above that the parables give a more

profound revelation of God than would have been possible through any logical formula or theoretical definition. "The father of the prodigal" is admittedly an analogical, anthropomorphic symbol of God, but it is nevertheless more true, not less true, than any theological statement could be. It is comparable to the Incarnation, because it points us to life, not to theory; not to mere reason alone, but to the fullness of personality. If it be true that the Supreme Source and Absolute Creator of all things is one in whose image man is made, is at least personal, almost certainly super-personal, and quite certainly not impersonal, then He is most adequately revealed in a life lived by a Person on earth; the ideal revelation will be an Incarnation. And a description of Him in a picture of the relations of actual human beings, recreated for us with startling psychological insight and artistic truth by One who was without any doubt the greatest master of the parable in all literature, will produce a life-giving fellowship with, and obedience to, Reality far more impressive than can be accomplished by any abstract philosophical attempt to escape the geocentric and the authropomorphic in an exact definition in purely theoretical terms.

The justification of the parabolic form in religion, however, rests on psychology also. It is a commonplace of the best modern research that theoretical, "rational," thinking and expression are, compared with pictorial thinking, a late and precarious and uncertain discovery of the human mind. It is no accident that the surviving examples of the self-expression of primitive man are not sentences, but pictures; and it is more than a curious speculation that the letters of our alphabet are pictures that have become conventionalised; these things acquire a new meaning when we realise that the thinking of animals, and children, and primitive man is, in all probability, nearly all done in pictures. And

education is much easier and more effective, especially for moral and practical ends, if it can, through pictures, make its direct impression on the primitive, non-intellectual subsoil of the human personality. Sacraments, object-lessons, action songs, the cinematograph, modern methods for teaching very young children, all build on this foundation. The sure understanding of a great love made our Lord put the revelation that was intended for "babes" (St. Matt. xi. 25) into pictures and stories.

All this means that He spoke in parables because truth came to Him in pictures, because definitions are less adequate, not more adequate, than symbols to express concrete reality, and because stories affect the values and motives and actions of unsophisticated people more directly and deeply and permanently than theoretical teaching about truth or goodness can do. He spoke in parables to be understood and obeyed. But the gospels make it clear that this is only one aspect of the truth in this matter. It is also true that He spoke in parables in order to hide His meaning, at least from those who were not prepared for it. It was given to His immediate friends and followers to "know the mystery of the kingdom of God," but to those without, everything had to be expressed in parables.[1] The fullest statement of this point of view is given in St. Matthew xiii. 10–16. "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables; because they seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias,[2] which saith, 'By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand,' etc.

[1] St. Mark iv. 10–12.

[2] This reference to Isaiah is one of the few words of Jesus given in all four gospels.

. . . But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear." It is part of the essential nature of the gospel method that it is not coercive either intellectually or sensationally; it appeals to, and develops, man's freedom, because it is very jealous of that freedom. The basis of logic and mathematics claims to be such that every man who is not insane, and uses his reason and understanding aright, can be compelled to admit its validity. But Christianity, and probably all religion, rests upon such an appeal to men's consciences and wills that they can, if they so choose, refuse to see it. Natural science claims to rest upon such an appeal to men's senses that, without self-contradiction, they must admit its premises. But Christ always refused to work miracles to convince unbelievers. He would not cast Himself down from the temple. He would not give the Pharisees a sign from heaven. He would not come down from the cross that they might "see and believe." After His resurrection, He appeared, not to Caiaphas and Herod and Pilate (to a certain type of mind He seems to have missed a great opportunity there), but to those who, though their faith was weak and fearful, loved Him. Always His appeal sought out those who were of His sort, so to speak; His sheep who hear His voice; those who have ears to hear. The servant of the Lord did not strive or cry, or make his voice heard in the streets. He whispered to those who could hear in such a way that the crowd could not overhear. He spake the word unto them, as they were able to bear it.[1] That is one reason why He spoke in parables.

It is a fact, even if it is a mysterious fact, that the "good news" of Jesus Christ picks men out, as the shepherd divides the sheep from the goats. To some it is a savour of death unto death, to some a savour of life unto life.[2] Heat softens

[1] St. Mark iv. 33. [2] 2 Cor. ii. 16.

some substances, and hardens others. So the Gospel appeals to what is good and strong in some men, and strengthens and quickens and increases that to which it appeals; they needs must love the highest when they see it. Others are repelled by Jesus Christ, in so far as they come to understand what He lived and died for; they despise what He loved; they love what He hated; these were those who saw and hated both Him and His Father.[1] And the fact that they had looked on Him did but make explicit, and strengthen them in their opposition to those values which His name stands for; they had now no cloak for their sins.[2] So our Lord warns His followers not to cast their pearls before swine, lest they not only trample the jewels under their feet, but turn and rend those who have offered them what is beyond their appreciation.[3] This, we shall see, may be another reason why He spoke in parables.

There is more than one indication in the gospels that our Lord's teaching was on two different levels, with two different kinds of clearness, according as it was private or public. Without a parable spake He not unto [the people]; and when they were alone, He expounded all things to His disciples.[4] When He was alone, they that were about Him with the twelve asked of Him the parable (of the sower).[5] In private, then, He spoke more clearly and plainly, explaining what was, assuredly of set purpose, left obscure in His public teaching. How, then, did Christ speak in private? The chief purpose of this article is to suggest that the Synoptic Gospels generally give us Christ's public teaching, while St. John gives us His teaching in private, and that this explains the well-known difference between the two types of teaching, and may give us a clue to the right relation between the Jerusalem ministry

[1] St. John xv. 24. [2] St. John ix. 22. [3] St. Matt. vii. 6.
[4] St. Mark iv. 34. [5] St. Mark iv. 10.

described by St. John, and the non-Judæan ministry described by the Three.

We have, in St. Matthew and St. Luke, one outstanding example of Christ's words in private. The disciples had just returned from their tour through the villages of Israel, with enthusiastic stories of their success. They reported that even the devils were subject unto them. The Lord was deeply moved, and His mystical joy found expression in an outburst of thanksgiving that His Father had seen fit to hide these things from the wise and prudent and had revealed them unto babes. To Him is given the complete revelation of the knowledge of God, and nobody knows the Son but the Father, and nobody knows the Father but the Son, and He to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him.[1] One's first impression of such a saying is that it is not synoptic, but Johannine.[2] But, as a fact, the saying belongs to Q, according to von Harnack, from the historical point of view, the best authority we possess concerning our Lord. And yet the Johannine character of the saying becomes more clear, the more clearly it is analysed.[3] The thanksgiving that " these things " are " hidden " from some has a harsh ring, resembling some of the polemical speeches in the Fourth Gospel. The metaphysical language of the saying, implying an eternal relation between the Father and the Son, and an absolute distinction between the Son and the rest of humanity, states a Christology which on the points here referred to is indistinguishable from that of St. John's gospel. It does not contradict the rest of the teaching of our Lord recorded in the Synoptic gospels; far from it. But here we have crystallised what is elsewhere in solution; here is stated what is implied elsewhere. The

[1] St. Matt. xi. 27 || St. Luke x. 22.
[2] Cf. W. E. Orchard, *The Necessity for Christ.*
[3] Cf. von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, Excursus 1, pp. 275–309.

more closely this passage is examined the more strongly the conclusion is suggested that the amazing difference between the vocabulary and style of Christ's speeches in St. John's gospel and those of His parables and vivid, striking epigrams in the synoptic gospels is explained by saying that the former represents His frank, confident expression of His whole message, while in the latter it is veiled in parables from all but those who have ears to hear. If this contrast seems too great to be possible between two habitual ways of speaking of the same person, it is at least not unparalleled. Everybody knows the difficult and twisted style of George Meredith, "chaos with an occasional flash of lightning." His ordinary conversation, when casual acquaintances or strangers were present, was of the same kind, obscure, elusive, over-intellectualised. Among his intimates, however, he talked simply and directly, but put on the armour of cleverness the moment a stranger entered. If it is conceivable that the style and substance of the speeches of Christ in St. John's gospel represent an actual Judæan ministry, and that some rejection or disappointment resulted in the altered manner of the Synoptic teaching in Galilee, we not only have an explanation of this remarkable difference, but other apparently disconnected facts fall into their place, and help to explain one another.

The Synoptic gospels, usually *assumed* to be of greater historical value than St. John, do not describe any Judæan ministry of our Lord before the visit to Jerusalem of the last week of His life, and to a casual reading they seem to leave no room for any such ministry. But two facts are noteworthy. First, there is Christ's lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children, as a hen gathereth her chickens . . . but thou wouldest not."[1] This *may* refer to God's appeals to Jeru-

[1] St. Matt. xxiii. 37 || St. Luke xiii. 34.

salem by the prophets; if so, it expresses an explicit consciousness of absolute identity with God which is not often recognisable in the Synoptics, and an assumption that God's acts are Christ's which is without parallel in any gospel. The more probable explanation of the verse is that it implies that our Lord had preached in Jerusalem on more than one occasion, although there is no account of such preaching in the Synoptic gospels. Secondly, although the chronological scheme of St. Mark seems clearer and more defensible than that of St. Matthew or St. Luke,[1] there are, in the early chapters of St. Mark, several loose expressions of time which make it possible that visits to Jerusalem have been left undescribed. We are told, for example,[2] that "after John had been delivered up" Jesus came into Galilee. But how long after, or whence He came, we are not told. Again, "after days" (*δι' ἡμερῶν*) Jesus entered into Capernaum;[3] a very vague date. And in the same chapter[4] we are told that Jesus was walking with His disciples through fields of ripe corn. This must have been immediately after a Passover. St. Mark has no mention of this Passover, or of our Lord's going to Jerusalem for it;[5] and yet there is no hint in any of the gospels that His opponents attacked Him for slackness in that matter. There is ample room, then, for the supposition that there were visits of Christ to Jerusalem, visits during which the Jerusalem ministry of the first ten chapters of St. John may have taken place, before the beginning of the Galilæan ministry described in the Synoptics. A recent book[6] has made the suggestion seem very plausible that there was rivalry and jealousy between Jerusalem Christians and those of Galilee, which, if it be

[1] See F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission.*
[2] St. Mark i. 14. [3] St. Mark ii. 1. [4] V. 23.
[5] On these passages see E. A. Abbott, *The Fourfold Gospel*, section 1. Intro. p. 89.
[6] Vivian Macmunn, *Neglected Galilee.*

true, may explain why the records of Christ's ministries in the two places have come down to us in traditions entirely distinct from each other. The usual critical assumption that, historically, the synoptic tradition is valuable, and the Johannine almost entirely worthless, does not make it easy to explain the fact that the post-resurrection Christian community centred round Jerusalem. There was never a church in Galilee. Surely a paradox if Christ's earthly ministry was confined to the latter place!

The contention of this article is that the earlier part of Christ's ministry was largely in Judæa and Jerusalem, that it was a direct appeal to the religious leaders and ecclesiastical authorities of Judaism, frank, and without any reserve or economy, and that its general character is expressed in St. John's Gospel. It ended in some such definite rejection and refusal as is described in St. John ix. The second part of the ministry (whether as long as the Judæan ministry, we do not now discuss) was shadowed by this rebuff. At first the Lord is still making His appeal through the normal ecclesiastical channels. He preaches in the synagogue on the Sabbath. But the suspicion and opposition of the religious leaders show themselves immediately.[1] St. Mark iii. 6 shows that already the definite breach is manifest; they are seeking to destroy Him. And St. Mark iii. 22 shews that the enemies had come from Jerusalem. The first of the parables, the story of the sower,[2] is a parable of disillusionment. More seed is wasted than finds the good ground. It is the story of a Teacher whose confidence in the acceptability of His message has been shaken, who knows that His appeal must be to the few, and that the majority are only waiting to understand

[1] St. Mark ii. 6, 16, 24; iii. 2.

[2] St. Mark iv. 3 ff., one of the very few parables told by all three synoptists.

what He means and they will destroy Him. His teaching now will be for those to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom. Only to them which have shall be given.

Two characteristics of Christ's teaching in the synoptic gospels. One is the note of urgency. The climax is imminent; the veil between time and eternity may be torn asunder at any moment. It is the merit of the Apocalyptic school that they have given its full value to this. The other characteristic of Christ's parables is their difficulty. After two thousand years some of them still baffle interpretation. It is not easy to see what He meant by the story of the steward who said to the creditor, take your account and write off 50 per cent. It is not certain whether the barren fig-tree is a parable of mercy or of condemnation. And who shall say whether the Last Judgment is a parable or a prophecy? And there are others. These two characteristics explain each other. Christ spoke in parables because His time was short; He was one working against time. He wanted to sow His seed before they crucified Him. His soul is always burdened with the fear that they will kill Him before He gets it said.

A. E. Baker.

## *THE FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT.*

(Ezekiel xxxiv.)

In the year 597 B.C. the kingdom of Judah came to an end for ever. Nebuchadnezzar carried away the young king Jehoiachin, the chief men of the state, and a great train of captives, and settled them in a kind of colony by the river of Chebar on a hill named Tel-Abib. So we could imagine the Kaiser, if he had been finally victorious, deporting the upper classes of Belgium or of our own country to Galicia or further.

Among these captives, who were not ill-treated, but allowed to live their own lives in their own community, was a young priest named *Ezekiel*, who had hung for years in boyish admiration on the inspired lips of Jeremiah, and was called to take up the rôle of prophet to the remnant of God's people in their abasement, to be as he says their "watchman," to teach them the real meaning of their distress, to hold up before them clearly and constantly the vision of their God, and never to let them doubt for an hour that the Exile was but a stage in the life of their race, that they or their descendants would go back again to the Holy Land, and so the nation would again take up after its period of punishment the work God had called it to do in His world.

In this thirty-fourth chapter we approach one of the themes on which Ezekiel was called to dwell. In his condemnation of the Shepherds of Israel we have not an attack on the priesthood or the prophetic order, the religious leaders of the nation, but a direct indictment of the later kings. The shepherds are the secular rulers, and their *failure as kings* had brought down judgment on themselves and their people. So the prophet teaches the exiles to look back on

their past as a nation, to take up the book of history, and to grasp the fact that the evils of the present are not spontaneous accidents, but that the life of a nation is like a chain, in which one link follows another, and by God's Providence the sins of the past reappear in the form of judgment.

And what had been the sins of the kings of Judah? Chiefly they had fed themselves instead of feeding the flock. They had drunk the milk, and made the wool into clothes, and butchered the sheep, and taken no trouble to look after the diseased, the wandering or the lost. While they enjoyed themselves any wild beast might come and do damage in the fold.

In this picturesque way the prophet asserts that the government had been rotten, selfish and prodigal. They had made the worst mistake that those in authority can make in acting as if they thought that the flock, over which power was given them, existed for their sake, to be plundered and tyrannized over, and not they for the sake of the flock. There are, it seems, these two ideals of government and only these two, whether it be the government of millions, or only the government of a family or a business—either the governor exists for the sake of the governed, or the governed for the sake of the governor. The history of the Jewish nation has been told that we may realise that the second is God's "Theory of government," that when He calls a man to rule He does not give a permission to tyrannise, to feather his own nest, like those Roman consuls who used to come home from their colonial governorships fabulously rich—but rather He gives a call to ceaseless and sedulous sacrifice for the sake of those governed, He confers the high responsibility to look after the sick and to bring back those who have wandered away. And more—the life of Jesus Christ was lived, and His Revelation given, and His Cross set up,

to reveal unmistakably the character of a good shepherd, and to inspire such a character in those that would follow in His steps.

In the sacristy of Notre Dame de Paris they show you the vestment of the archbishop who was shot by the revolutionaries in the second revolution while he appealed to them. It is stained with blood, the robe of that shepherd, and it is said that he murmured as he went on his perilous path: "Bonus pastor dat vitam pro ovibus." He at least had realised the meaning of rule.

And Ezekiel as he looked back saw evil in the flock itself—the shadow of the sins of the princes in the lives and morals of the people—for the characters of the governors and the governed always react on one another. The strong rams and he-goats trod down the pasture and fouled the water when they had taken their fill. So the magnates, the aristocracy, the millionaires in Israel had been utterly careless of the needs of the poor, brutally neglectful of other people's interests, and vulgarly ostentatious and wasteful. The lean cattle struggling for a livelihood had been thrust aside from pasture or brook by the side and shoulder of the stout and strong: the weak and sickly had been gored by the horns of the selfish. Here was the prophet's indictment of the state of Israel, as he had known it, brooded over it, smarted at it, and hated it when a boy in the Temple courts, that spoke of a God to whom these things were an abomination.

But the gloomiest Hebrew retrospect runs soon like a kaleidoscope into the glory of a bright future. The failure of man, says Ezekiel, does but stir up God to do His work Himself. "Therefore will I save my flock." God's purpose is too grand and assured to be defeated altogether by human imperfection.

If the commissioned fail, God will do His work without

them. The loss is theirs, not His. He will set up a new David who shall be a true shepherd, and He will in due time make a covenant of peace with them. And in the joys of that covenant Nature will share. No evil beast shall alarm or attack the flock, the rain shall fall abundantly, the field shall bear good harvests, and the orchard be full of fruit, all shall be safe, and fearless, and well-fed, and well-cared for.

So Ezekiel prophesies for God's people a future of happiness under a righteous government, in which there shall be no more selfishness, no more corruption or injustice. It is all summed up in that vision of a restored David, the righteous Prince.

We know full well that though the Jews came back from exile, his prophecy was not fulfilled in the way he thought. No great line of princes arose to ward off the attacks of Greek or Roman. The vulgar struggle for material things continued, and when the new David came they were too far gone to receive Him.

We believe that the inspiration of God shone further out, like a great searchlight, than the prophet knew when he spoke the obscure and ambiguous word. We believe that though the prophecy is not actually fulfilled to the chosen people, it is spiritually fulfilled in ways far outshining his vision and his dream. We believe that it is not even yet fulfilled, but is still in process of fulfilment in Jesus Christ. For we know that every principle of life according to God's will is shown forth in Him, the life of man as an obedient child of God, the life of man as brother and brother, the life of man in which one is set to be another's keeper, and to give himself to live and die for the safety of that charge of flesh and blood over which he is responsible. And it is only as the life and spirit of Jesus Christ does make its way into governments, His devotion, His love, His sacrifice, His

truth and honour and justice, that the failures of governments will be abolished, and their mistakes made impossible. It may seem to us a very long way off still, this permeation of governments with the Christ-Spirit. The war itself in which men were hurried by the million to butchery, and every family in vast empires called to mourn, for the sake of what seems to us but ambition and aggrandisement, how short a distance was this from the spirit of Paganism!

But there is much that might be said on the other side. One thunder-storm does not destroy the course of a beneficent season. Neither could this colossal outburst vitiate the progress of Christ's Spirit, or the power of His reign. Nay, it did but reveal the spirit of a false kingship in all its ugliness, and militarism in all its unmasked hideousness.

We must be like Ezekiel, and keep that inspiring vision of God's future ever before our eyes. We must realise it as built with stones of sacrifice on the ruins of failure; we must rest assured that slowly and stedfastly the Spirit of Christ is moving towards the conquest of all that is human.

And we must see that we ourselves at least are good shepherds of that which is entrusted to us—for it is God's trust, be it small or great.

W. J. Ferrar.

## *JEWISH APOCALYPTIC IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.*

### I.

By the end of the first Christian century, or a little later, the type of thought represented by the Apocalpytic literature of Judaism had come to its most complete expression. This literature has come down to us mainly in translations which owe their survival to the fact that they circulated among Christian communities where the Apocalyptic books for a time enjoyed great popularity; but, with the important exception of the Book of Daniel, the Hebrew or Aramaic originals have been lost. The latter Book owes its good fortune to the fact that it was ultimately—only, it would seem, with some reluctance—included in the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. The loss of the Semitic originals is, as we shall see, highly significant.

All this literature is important, not only from the historical point of view as enabling us to trace the evolution of certain doctrines and views, but also as possessing a certain validity even for an age later than that for which some of these books were primarily written. The Book of Daniel for instance, though originally it was evoked by a particular historical crisis, the persecution of the Jewish religion by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. and the following years, yet continued to be studied and to exercise a marked influence long after the time when the original

crisis had passed away. It, in fact, served to shape a tradition which persisted, and was adjusted from time to time to meet new situations. The same is true in greater or less degree of the other apocalypses that have survived; they continued to be cherished in certain circles, as is shewn by the fact that they have come down to us in translations which were in circulation for a long time after the original publication of the books. The period that intervened between the first appearance of *Daniel* and the publication of the last of the great Jewish apocalypses—the (Syriac) *Baruch* and 4 Ezra—may roughly be said to have lasted three centuries (165 B.C. to 120 A.D.). It was during this fruitful epoch in Jewish religious development that such important literature appeared as the Book of Enoch,[1] the groundwork of which (chaps. i.–xxxvi. and lxxii.–cviii.) may, perhaps, be dated at about 100 B.C., or even later, while the Similitudes (chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi.) probably belong to the pre-Christian period, but are to be dated not many years before Christ. The 'Slavonic' Enoch (2 Enoch) may be dated some time before 70 A.D. Besides these Enochic Books *the Assumption of Moses* (between 4 B.C. and 10 A.D.), and *the Apocalypse of Abraham* fall within the first century A.D. probably, while the twin Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra (=2 Esdras iii.–xiv.) may have been edited in their present form about 120 A.D. The groundwork of the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs* may be pre-Christian (? early 1st century B.C.), but in its present form it may be dated in the first century A.D. These books represent the apocalyptic literature proper,[2] but extensive

[1] I.e. the so-called 'Ethiopic' Enoch (1 Enoch), which has been handed down in its most complete form in an Ethiopic translation. A large Greek fragment has also been recovered.

[2] Books of an apocalyptic character, composed originally in Greek, also circulated among Hellenistic Jews, as is shewn by parts of the *Sibyllins*

as they are, they form only a fragment of that literature. Some, otherwise lost, are known from citations in the Fathers (Origen and others), as e.g. the *Apocalypse of Elijah* and the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*. But the great apocalypses that have come down to us themselves contain evidence of the existence of a larger literature of the same kind, which has disappeared. Thus, as Dr. Charles has pointed out, "the Book of Enoch is a fragmentary survival of an entire literature that once circulated under his name."[1] Translations of this literature (probably Aramaic and Greek) are apparently referred to in 1 Enoch (cf. civ., 11 f.), and this fact implies its wide dissemination; a hostile literature—probably Hellenistic Antinomian—seems also to have been widely current (cf. xcviii. 15 f.)[2] But perhaps the most striking piece of evidence of the activity of the apocalyptists, and the widely ramified character of the apocalyptic literature in the first century A.D., is contained in 4 Ezra xiv. 44 ff., in the legendary account of Ezra's restoration of the Hebrew Scriptures:

> *So in forty days were written ninety-four books. And it came to pass when the forty days were fulfilled, that the Most High spake unto me saying: The twenty-four books* (i.e. the canonical Scriptures) *that thou hast written, publish that the worthy and unworthy may read therein: but the seventy last* (i.e. the Apocalyptic books) *thou shalt keep, to deliver them to the wise among thy people.*
>
> *For in them is the spring of understanding,*
> *the fountain of wisdom,*
> *and the stream of knowledge.*

It is clear from this passage that not only were the apoca-

*Oracles*. The 'Slavonic' Enoch may originally have been composed in Greek, though this is not certain. Books closely related to the Apocalypses proper are the *Psalms of Solomon* (? 64–40 B.C.), the *Book of Jubilees* (some time in first century B.C.), and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

[1] *Enc. Bibl.* i. col. 221.

[2] *Woe unto you who write down lying and godless words.*

lyptic books in circulation at the end of the first century A.D. very numerous, forming in fact a literature much larger in bulk than the Old Testament Scriptures, but this literature was held in the highest estimation within certain Jewish circles. It is, to some extent, esoteric in character, and a certain feeling of pride in the possession of the full tradition of the inner circle unmistakably comes to expression. While the letter of the Scriptures, which were publicly read and expounded in the Synagogues, could reach all, worthy and unworthy alike, the complete doctrine was the possession of the chosen few. This simply means that the supremely important thing is the apocalyptic interpretation of the Scriptures. A knowledge of the bare text is insufficient. The two things are conceived as not so much in conscious opposition as complementary. Exactly the same view was held in orthodox Rabbinical circles regarding the relation of the written Law and the oral interpretation embodied in the Rabbinical Literature.

But if the apocalyptic books were esoteric in character, how far can they be regarded as reflecting popular views as to religious belief? Must they not be looked upon, as some Jewish scholars claim, as 'a sort of heretical backwater of legal Judaism,' as in no sense a true index to popular piety?

In answer to this objection it may be said:

(1) Esoteric teaching usually maintains its secret character only in the first stage of its existence, but as it spreads and wins adherents it will, at some time or other, assume a written form and then ultimately become public property. Many instances of such a process might be cited. A somewhat parallel case meets us in the tradition of the oral law, which for centuries was treasured in Rabbinic circles as

too sacred a thing to be written down, though it was ultimately reduced to writing.

There were, no doubt, inner circles of apocalyptists where the special tradition was first of all elaborated, and given its literary form, and where the ecstatic and other peculiar religious experiences shared by the apocalyptists were first of all divulged. And it seems clear that certain apocalyptic conceptions—e.g. the idea of the Messianic Son of Man—never became widely current or familiar. But, on the other hand, it was mainly owing to Apocalyptic influence that the fundamental doctrine of the resurrection became an integral part of the popular faith. This, alone, is sufficient to shew that apocalyptic influence was by no means confined to small and unimportant circles.

(2) But in the case of the apocalyptic books we have undoubtedly to deal with real books, which, though not intended for perusal by the 'unworthy' or uninitiated, were yet circulated in written form among certain sections of people. In this case the esoteric character assigned to the Book may have been intended to account for its late appearance (so already Daniel, cf. also 4 Ezra); the Book had only been concealed and treasured in secret till the opportune moment for its publication had arrived; and further, in apocalyptic circles a virtue may have been made of necessity, and when the whole of this literature, with the exception of *Daniel*, had been definitely excluded from canonical recognition we can well believe that the apocalyptists not only accepted the fact, but gloried in it. "With pride and affection," to use Dr Schmidt's words, "their friends called these books *gĕnuzîm* ('Apocrypha'), i.e. books containing precious secret and mystical lore. That an apocalyptical book might under certain circumstances, in spite of its 'hidden' character, force its way into the

Canon is proved by the case of the Book of Daniel."

It has sometimes been urged that the apocalyptic literature is of Essene origin. If this hypothesis be correct we shall only be justified in regarding the characteristic beliefs and aspirations expressed by the apocalyptists as emanating from insignificant circles, but in no sense a reflex of popular piety. In support of this view the evidence of Josephus[1] is appealed to, who says that the Essenes possessed a traditional knowledge of the healing properties of plants and stones, and " by reading holy books, and using several sorts of purifications, and being perpetually conversant with the discourses of the prophets," they were able to foretell future events. Possibly their medical books contained magical formulas which were used for determining the future. They were famed as prophets, led an extremely ascetic mode of life, and " have by their excellent virtue been thought worthy of the knowledge of divine revelations."[2] They seem also to have possessed a traditional knowledge of the names of angels, and to have been interested in the fate of souls after death.

On the other hand, the most fundamental and characteristic doctrine of the apocalyptists, that of the resurrection, was absolutely rejected by the Essenes ; nor does it appear that the latter were interested in Messianic doctrine, which is central in the apocalyptic literature. The ascetic tendency which characterises both was certainly not confined to Essene circles in the first century of our era. We may, therefore, safely regard the Essene and apocalyptic movements as parallel and perhaps related, but essentially independent. This is not to deny that Essene influence is occasionally traceable in the apocalypses. Perhaps 1 Enoch

[1] Cf. *War*, II, 8, and the parallel passages.
[2] *Ant.* XV., 10, 5.

cviii., which is apparently an independent piece, is of Essene origin; it is certainly Essene in tone. Passages which depreciate the second Temple and its rites (cf. 1 Enoch lxxxix. 50, 73; xc. 28 f.; cf. *Assumpt. of Moses*, v.–vii.) may also owe something to Essene influence.

Some scholars[1] have gone to the other extreme and maintain that the Apocalypses were written by orthodox (Pharisaic) rabbis. If this assertion be true *cadit quaestio*; there is nothing more to be said, and we must link up and correlate the typical expressions of Rabbinic and apocalyptic thought as best we can. The Jewish apocalypses are mainly concerned with the Messianic hope; while the Rabbis devoted their chief energies to the study and elucidation of the Law. The two are mutually complementary; therefore, it may be argued, they were combined and represented by the same people, viz., the rabbis, and their orthodox following. But the question cannot be disposed of so easily and in this summary fashion. In fact it does not admit of a simple solution.

Dr. Charles, in one of his notes, observes:

> The Law was the centre round which Jewish thought and life revolved. To a limited extent the Messianic expectation was a centre. Frequently we find that in proportion as the one is emphasised the other falls into the background.

If we assume that the early Rabbis, as well as the later, were mainly pre-occupied with the study of the Law and subordinated to this the Messianic hope, while the Apocalyptists reversed the process, then the difference between the two systems of thought is primarily one of emphasis. But a difference of emphasis may involve as a consequence differences of outlook and theory of the most profound and far-reaching character. In the one case the study of the

[1] E.g. A. Sabatier.

Law, though pursued in a dialectical way in the Rabbinical schools, was essentially practical. It had for its object the reduction of the Law to practice on the largest scale as a rule of life for priests and people of the community of Israel. The interests of the Rabbis and of the Pharisaic party generally were concerned intensely with everyday life. From this point of view the best preparation for the future would be to consentrate on the present, by extending the practice of the Law, and thus investing the present life with the full sanctions of religion. True, the Rabbis hoped and prayed for the advent of a better future, when the abominations would be removed from the earth, and idolatry utterly extirpated, when the sovereignty of God would be perfected by the removal of the kingdom of violence, and all creation prostrate itself in adoration before the one Holy God. But the teachers of the Law were in no sense other-worldly. They shared to some extent the Messianic hopes of the people, but they took care to paint their Messiah in sober colours. His *rôle* is never exaggerated. Indeed, in some cases, it would seem as if the Rabbinical teachers conceived the ideal future as the result of a gradual process which is bound up with the study of the Law, and the practice of good works. Doubtless under the stress of crisis, when the political conditions of the time impeded or menaced the interests of religion, Messianic hopes, even in Pharisaic circles, come to more ardent expression. Such an expression meets us in the beautiful description of the anointed King given in the 17th of the *Psalms of Solomon*, which in its ideal aspirations is not surpassed in the loftiest passages of the Synagogue Liturgy :

*A righteous King and taught of God is he that reigneth over them ;*
*And there shall be no iniquity in his days in their midst,*
*For all shall be holy and their King is the Lord's Messiah.*

*For he shall not put his trust in horse and rider and bow,*
*Nor shall he multiply unto himself gold and silver for war, nor by ships shall he gather confidence for the day of battle.*
*The Lord himself is his King, and the hope of him that is strong in the hope of God.*
*And he shall have mercy upon all the nations that come before him in fear.*
*For he shall smite the earth with the word of his mouth even for evermore. He shall bless the people of the Lord with wisdom and gladness.*
*He himself also is pure from sin, so that he may rule a mighty people, and rebuke princes and overthrow sinners by the might of his word.*
*And he shall not faint all his days, because he leaneth upon his God ; for God shall cause him to be mighty through the spirit of holiness, and wise through the counsel of understanding with might and righteousness.*
*And the blessing of the Lord is with him in might, and his hope in the Lord shall not faint.*
*And who can stand up against him ? He is mighty in his works and strong in the fear of God.*
*Tending the flock of the Lord with faith and righteousness ; and he shall suffer none among them to faint in their pasture.*

That such a description could have been put forth when the party of the pious were oppressed by ungodly rulers within and by the irruption of heathen forces from without (? 63 B.C.) is a striking fact. In the face of trials so sore the Psalmist's expression of his aspirations is balanced and restrained, and he confines himself to the description of a Messiah who shall rule by moral, not by physical force, and who shall realise the ideal reign of wisdom and righteousness, and so safeguard "the fundamental Pharisaic position that the Law was supreme." The Psalmist's picture unites "the craving for a Jewish king with the theocratic interpretation of Israel's mission to the world."[1] We miss the note of "other-worldliness" so characteristic of the typical representatives of apocalyptic literature. How very far from other-worldliness the Pharisees really were may be illus-

[1] Ryle and James, *The Psalms of the Pharisees*, p. lviii.

trated from the way in which they invested the yearly New Year's Festival with the associations of the Day of Judgment, in this way bringing the idea into the closest possible contact with the present life, and so enhancing its moral effectiveness. In fine, we are justified in saying, I think, that while the Messianic hope, the coming in of God's sovereignty, and the eschatological ideas of future judgment, retribution, and the future world were real and essential parts of the Pharisaic faith, yet these beliefs were never allowed to obtrude upon or to overshadow their intense devotion to the Law as the first and primary reality of revelation, the most important and absorbing aspect of which was that it was a present and exacting rule of life.

When we turn to the typical apocalyptic books we at once feel ourselves in a different atmosphere. Perhaps the most striking characteristic of these books is their *supernatural colouring*. The two poles of apocalyptic thought are not so much present and future, on the plane of earthly development, as *above* and *below*. Earth is but a shadow of heaven, the issues are really determined in the realm above. The future age is conceived as a sudden irruption of celestial forces from the other world. It is for this blinding but glorious catastrophe that the apocalyptist longs and yearns with painful eagerness. The other-worldly spirit thus reaches, in these books, its most sublimated expression. This supernatural colouring is also reflected in the form of the apocalyptic books. They are full of strange and cryptic symbolism (*e.g.*, the animal symbolism of *Daniel* and parts of *Enoch*) ; they employ the vision and the dream as regular vehicles for revelation ; there is also a rich angelology and demonology. Doubtless the employment of cryptograms and mystic signs (such as the number 666, and the " beast "

in the apocalypse of St. John, and the "little horn" in *Daniel*, as symbols for Nero and Antiochus respectively) was dictated partly by reasons of prudence. Nevertheless, the particular symbols chosen reflect the mysterious character so much loved by these writers. But the mystery is not mere literary mystification. The apocalyptists were conscious that divine secrets must contain in them something incomprehensible by merely finite intelligence. This feeling often comes to expression, and nowhere more finely or religiously than in 4 Ezra. The following passage may be cited by way of illustration. In chapter iv., in answer to Ezra's despairing interjection: *It would have been better that we had never been created than having come* [*into the world*] *to live in sins and suffer, and not know why we suffer*, the archangel delivers a parable from the woods and the sea:

> Once upon a time the woods of the trees of the field went forth and took counsel and said: Come, let us go and make war against the sea, that it may retire before us, and we will make us more woods. In like manner, also, the waves of the sea took counsel and said: Come, let us go up and wage war against the wood of the field, that there also we may win us more territory.
>
> The counsel of the wood was in vain, for the fire came and consumed it: likewise also the counsel of the waves of the sea, for the sand stood up and stopped them. If thou, now [the archangel asks] hadst been judge between them, whom wouldest thou have justified, and whom condemned?
>
> Ezra replies: Both have taken a foolish counsel: for to the wood the land has been assigned, and to the sea a place to bear its waves.
>
> The archangel rejoins: Thou hast judged aright; but why hast thou not given judgment in thine own case? For just as the earth has been assigned to the wood, and the place of the sea to bear its waves—even so the dwellers upon earth can understand only what is upon the earth, and they who are above the heavens that which is above the heavenly height.

This feeling for the mystery that so largely surrounds things divine will account for a feature of the apocalyptic

literature which must have struck every student who has examined it at all—its mixed character of half revelation, half-concealment.

Another peculiarity, to which reference has already been made, is its pseudonymous character: it is worth noting, also, how it is pervaded by a curious phraseology, which is almost technical.

The general aim of apocalyptic was to solve some difficult problems concerning God's government of the world and the experience of the pious individual. There thus emerges in the apocalypses a double eschatology—that of the nation, and that of the individual.

The apocalyptists evolved what has been described as a sort of religious philosophy of history. While eager readers of Scripture, they seem to have been given themselves more to the study of the Prophets than the Law. They take the largest view of things, and their scheme, if somewhat bizarre, is elaborated on the largest scale and, in conception, is not without elements of the sublime.

One conviction which all apocalyptic writers shared was that they stood *at the end of the age*. While they took a pessimistic view of the present world, they are not to be regarded as pessimists in the strict sense of the term. They give up the present for the future. This world must be abolished and destroyed in order to allow something better to take its place. *The age is hastening fast to its end*, says the apocalyptist in 4 Ezra (iv. 26): *my little children, it is the last hour*, says the apostolic writer.

In a remarkable passage in the Ezra-Apocalypse the writer enforces the view that evil must run its course before better things can be hoped for, as follows:

*The evil . . . is sown; but the gathering of it is not yet come. Unless, therefore, that which is sown be reaped, and unless the place where the*

*evil is sown shall have passed away, the field where the good is sown cannot come.*

And again:

*He hath weighed the age in a balance,*
*And with measure hath measured the times,*
*And by number hath numbered the seasons.* (vi. 36.)

Modern investigation, especially as represented by the work of Gunkel and his pupil Gressmann, has shewn how much traditional popular mythological material has found its way into apocalyptic. Herein, it seems to me, lies one of the great marks of distinction between the apocalyptic literature and the Rabbinic. The Rabbis, it is true, often enough make excursions into the domain of folk-lore, especially in the *Haggada*. They, too, dig in the rich soil of popular tradition. Only they handle the material in their own way, and usually refine its coarser and cruder features away, especially where any question of religious belief or practice is involved. On the other hand, some of the old mythical material preserved in apocalyptic retains its crude and antique features with startling distinctness. The old material is perpetuated in its traditional forms in different apocalyptic books. Good instances of this meet us in the vision of the four beasts in Daniel vii. and the Son of Man vision in 4 Ezra xiii. Here the lack of adjustment in many details between the actual vision and the interpretation imposed upon it at once suggests that the material of the vision is much older than the time of the author who is using it. It belongs, in fact, to the realm of free popular tradition.

Another example, and one which seems to me particularly illuminating in this connexion, is the use made by some of the apocalyptists of the story in Genesis vi. of the sons of God

taking wives of the daughters of men. The ancient (perhaps Persian) myth appears in its full-blown form in these books, and assumes high theological importance, becoming, in fact, the foundation of a theory that sin is in the main to be traced back to this event, rather than to the disobedience of Adam and Eve. This idea belongs to a cycle of thought which, so far as I am aware, is alien to Rabbinic theology. The Rabbis, so far as they connect the origin of sin with any external cause or event, connect it with Adam's disobedience.

The specifically Rabbinic doctrine of sin is that of the *Yeser ha-ra'*, the evil impulse, and comes down from the old conservative Scribism, as is evident from Sirach. The doctrine which brings moral evil into connexion with Genesis vi. 1 and 4, holds sin "to have had its source and origin in transgressions and conflicts in the angelic sphere. Fallen angels admitted men into the knowledge of forbidden secrets, and corrupted the world with their lust, and continued demonic incitement to evil has been the result."[1] This doctrine is characteristic of all sections of the Book of Enoch, and it is probably to the influence of this literature that its appearance in such books as *The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs* and *Jubilees* is due. But it should be noted that the former book combines the doctrine with that of the evil *Yeser*. The appearance of the doctrine in such a book as *Jubilees*, which upholds so many positions dear to orthodox Judaism, is certainly remarkable. May not this fact partly account for the exclusion of the book from Rabbinic recognition ? The absence of any reference to the doctrine in *Daniel* is also significant. It can hardly have failed to recommend the book in the eyes of the Rabbis, to whom *Daniel* in comparison with *Enoch* must have appeared

[1] H. M. Hughes, *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature*, p. 169.

so much the more orthodox. If Halévi's acute suggestion that 'Enoch' was the original reading in the two passages in Ezekiel where 'Daniel' is mentioned in the present text (xiv. 2, xxviii. 3) be accepted, this may perhaps be regarded as due to later revision in order to remove some of the objections to the book's canonicity. Difficulties on this point did, as is well known, arise in connexion with the book of Ezekiel, which were not easily overcome.

Another point worth noting in connexion with the earlier Enochic literature is the view that it may have arisen in Galilee; the selection of Mount Hermon as the scene of revelation in the Book of Enoch (cf. vi. 6) suggests this.

The considerations here adduced are sufficiently cogent; it seems to the present writer, to warrant the conclusion that the Enochic books represent a distinct cycle of thought and literary activity which grew up outside and independently of the Scribal schools of orthodox tradition. We may thus regard the apocalyptist school as marking a distinct tendency within Judaism. This is not to deny that apocalyptic influence was exercised outside. It was inevitable that there should be action and reaction. There were apocalyptic Rabbis as well as Rabbinic apocalyptists. But essentially the two tendencies were independent, not to say opposed. Perhaps the earliest example of a book where apocalyptic influence has operated from outside is the *Book of Jubilees*. One of its titles is, of course, *The Apocalypse of Moses*, which is appropriate enough, since the author makes Moses the recipient of the disclosures which the book professes to make. But its spirit is very far from being that of a typical apocalypse. It is more akin to that of Talmudic Judaism. The Law is glorified as an eternal ordinance; the Patriarchs are depicted as

Rabbinical examples of piety. Circumcision, the Sabbath, the laws of purification are insisted on, and Israel's separation from the Gentiles is sharply enunciated. Moreover the oral law (*i.e.* the unwritten tradition) is invested with patriarchal sanctions. Messianic features, as would be expected, are not over-emphasised. Apparently the author believed that the Messianic age was about to dawn, and that a kingdom ruled over by a Messiah drawn from the tribe of Judah would soon arise. "This kingdom," to use Dr. Charles' words, would be "gradually realised on earth, and the transformation of physical nature would go hand in hand with the ethical transformation of man, till there was a new heaven and a new earth. Thus, finally, all sin and pain would disappear, and men would live to the age of 1,000 years in happiness and peace, and after death enjoy a blessed immortality in the spirit world." The book is rather in the nature of a midrash or a Targum than a true apocalypse, and the positions it maintains are such as would, one would expect, have commended it to orthodox Rabbinical Judaism. But it championed a calendric system which was not adopted, and moreover was tainted slightly with unorthodoxy on other points (such as connecting sin in the earth with the fall of the angelic watchers) ; hence it was rejected by the later Rabbis.

Passing to a later period—the latter part of the first century A.D.—we have in the Ezra-Apocalypse and the *Apocalypse of Baruch* two works which combine a good deal of Rabbinic theology with an essentially apocalyptic view of things. Both were written in their present form at a date subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and both presuppose that fateful event. They form precious monuments of the thoughts which agitated the minds of many orthodox Jews in consequence of that

awful catastrophe, and illustrate, in an interesting way, some of the characteristic features of Rabbinic and apocalyptic thought in juxtaposition. They, perhaps, represent a last attempt at compromise between the two parties—an attempt which failed. After the middle of the second century A.D. Judaism definitely committed itself to the Rabbinic type of theology and thought exclusively. Apocalyptic literature was banned. It had already become suspect, owing to its cultivation in Christian circles, and it is hardly surprising that it should have shared the fate of other Jewish literature (*e.g.*, the old Greek Bible), which had been appropriated by Christians, in being banished from the circles of later orthodox Judaism. Nevertheless it is well to remember that the apocalyptic books are largely based upon Hebrew or Aramaic originals, which have perished. Only translations have survived. Rabbinical Judaism must thus be held responsible for having eliminated a large and valuable element from the old Hebrew Literature.

## II

The main characteristics of the apocalyptic type of literature have already been stated briefly above. It remains, before we proceed to set forth some of its more important theological aspects, to add one or two further remarks, and to emphasise some points, already touched upon, afresh.

It is important, then, to realise (*a*) that this literature is *popular* in character ; that is to say, it reflects in literary form, more or less elaborated, the thoughts of religious circles which were outside the Rabbinical schools ; and it embodies religious ideas which, in many respects, conflicted sharply with the strict scholastic orthodoxy of the Pharisees.

As Professor F. C. Porter[1] observes : the "apocalypses are books of and for the laity. Both learning and authority are unfavourable to the writing of such books : learning, because with it ordered thought takes the place of images whose appeal is to the fancy and to the child-nature in man ; authority, because the apocalypse looks for divine interventions and reversals which those who are already prosperous and powerful do not expect or desire." It is true, of course, that the Pharisees rose from the ranks of the laity, and led the revolt against corruption in high places. But it does not follow that the Pharisees, even at the beginning of their history, ever adopted a purely apocalyptic view of things. They were influenced by the apocalyptists, and the breach did not come till later. The two lay movements are to be regarded as parallel, but not identical. If we study the maxims of the early Pharisaic teachers preserved in the *Pirke Aboth—the sayings of the Jewish Fathers*—we find much of a prudential and practical character, and much about the glory of the study of the Law, much about teachers and teaching, but little or nothing to suggest the other-worldly aspirations so characteristic of apocalyptic. It is interesting in this connexion to consider the attitude of the apocalyptists to the Law. This, it need hardly be said, is not entirely consistent. Thus its possession by Israel is regarded in the *Apocalypse of Baruch* as the greatest of boons. It is their hope (li. 7), justifies them (li. 3), and will ensure final felicity (li. 7 ff.). The tone of confidence and satisfaction in the possession of the Law is very remarkable in this apocalypse. It comes to striking expression in the following passage :

*For we are all named one people, who have received one Law from One, and the Law which is amongst us will aid us, and*

[1] *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers*, p. 17.

*the surpassing wisdom which is in us will help us* (xlviii. 24). On the other hand, in the Ezra-Apocalypse, while the Law is glorified as a divine gift to Israel, and as in itself inherently divine, the apocalyptic writer is painfully conscious of its impotence to redeem and save the sinner (ix. 29 ff.)—and among the 'sinners' he reckons by far the larger part of Israel itself: *We who have received the Law and sinned must perish* (ix. 36; cf. Rom. iii. 20); to a race doomed to sin the promises of the Law are a mockery (vii. 116–121). The utmost that the seer can hope from the Law is that while the many are born to perish, but few shall be saved (ix. 15). The tone here is markedly different from that of the Baruch apocalypse.

In general it is to be observed that while the apocalyptists are loyal to the Law they are not, as a rule, pre-occupied with it. They are looking beyond it to the great consummation. This is true even of the Baruch passages cited above. In 1 Enoch there are comparatively few references to the Law at all, though it is spoken of as of eternal obligation (xcix. 2), and apostasy from it is fiercely denounced (xcix. 14). The minute and painstaking justification of belief and practice by reference to the Law so characteristic of Rabbinical Literature, the strained exegesis of the text of Scripture, and the curious exegetical methods which the Rabinical teachers so much loved are entirely absent from the apocalyptical writings. And where in the latter can we discover a trace of that formalism which is the besetting danger of a legalistic religion, and which Jesus found occasion to denounce in certain sections of the Pharisees of His time? The *minutiae* of sabbath-observance, which was a burning question at the time of Christ's ministry, find no place in the apocalyptic writings.[1] It seems clear

[1] Such an admonition as that in 1 Baruch lxxxiv. 8: *and remember*

that the central interest of the apocalyptists are quite different from those of the Rabbis.

It is not that the apocalyptists are uninterested in Scripture. Far from it. They were eager students of one whole section of the Old Testament, viz., the prophetical books. This is a highly significant fact. They are concerned not so much with the Law as with prophecy. In a sense they were the successors of the prophets. The study of the apocalyptic literature and of the canonical prophetic writings of the Old Testament has made it increasingly clear that there is a large apocalyptic element in the prophetical books. This feature begins to become marked in Ezekiel, and asserts itself strongly in the post-exilic prophets. As compared with the earlier prophets Ezekiel's

conception of God is more transcendental, his vision of God marked by more sensuous and fantastic imagery, the inspiration of the seer more external and supernaturalistic. His revelations come in visions interpreted by angels. His later message is less ethical and more simply religious, that is he does not preach repentance and reformation, but rests his hope wholly upon God's direct deed, for his own glory and in his own time. The hope does not wait for man's righteousness as its condition, but includes the miraculous renewal of man's incurably evil heart. The land of Palestine is also miraculously transformed, and the new land and city and temple have little to do with nature. A final vain assault by the wild horsemen of Gog from the land of Magog will fulfil the predictions of Jeremiah and Zephaniah, and prove the security of the city in which God himself dwells. Man does not by any effort or merit of his bring in the Messianic age, and man cannot by any powers however demoniacal bring disaster upon it. One needs only to compare Ezekiel's hope with that of the older prophets who preached a repentance which might come before judgment and avert it, or through the discipline of judgment, in order to realise how radical the difference is.[1]

*ye the Law and Sion, and the holy land and your brethren, and the covenant of your fathers, and forget not the festivals and sabbaths* is something quite different.

[1] F. C. Porter, *op. cit.* p. 21 f.

The apocalyptic tendency can be traced with increasing clearness through the later prophetic literature—in the soaring lyrics of Deutero-Isaiah, in such post-exilic pieces as Isaiah xxxiv.–xxxv., in Zechariah i.–viii. (as well as in the later appendix ix.–xiv.), in Joel, and in Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii. The prophecies of Zechariah (i.–viii.) are particularly noteworthy, because here the writer depends upon older prophets, he also employs almost exclusively the vision-form, his angelology is highly developed,[1] and he makes large use of fantastic figures. Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., too, is notable for the emergence into clear expression of the belief in the resurrection of the righteous in Israel (xxvi. 19), and the idea of the punishment of wicked angels (xxiv. 21–23); while the use made of the 'monster of the Sea' in xxvii. 1 prepares the way for the more elaborate developments of the idea in Daniel and the later apocalypses. One very large element in apocalyptic may be termed political. It comes to expression in a fierce denunciation of the oppressive world-power, whatever power that may happen to be, whether Syria or Rome. To some extent the way had been prepared for this development in earlier prophecy, in the oracles directed against foreign nations. These become more concentrated and of larger import in the exilic oracles against Babylon (Isa. xiii.–xiv., Jer. l.–li.), and influenced the later apocalyptists. It is true, then, to say that one large element in the canonical prophetic books is continued and developed in the apocalyptic writings. The apocalyptist, as has been pointed out, was an eager student of the earlier prophets. But

it was the eschatology of the prophets that interested him most; not the efforts at moral and social reform, but the forecasts of the future; not the conversion of his people, but their deliverance from

[1] Note, too, the part assigned to Satan.

trouble, and especially from subjection to the heathen. He searched for signs of the last day, for the mysteries of heaven and the angelic world that might explain the evils of the present and give a clew to the time and manner of the end of evil and the disclosure of God and heavenly blessings. There is hardly an important idea in the apocalypses for which the beginnings and points of contact cannot be found in older prophecy.[1]

If the reader will look at the list of citations from the Old Testament in the New Testament *Apocalypse*, as tabulated by Westcott and Hort, he will see how large the preponderance of references to the prophetic Books is; Daniel and Ezekiel are constantly cited, and while there are a certain number of quotations and reminiscences of passages from the Law and the Psalms, the former are comparatively not numerous.

At the same time there is a marked contrast, as a whole, between this literature and the work of the ancient prophets. The atmosphere is different, the use of fantastic imagery and symbolism is much greater in extent; the dualism, the transcendental conception of God, the supernatural setting—all lend an air of other-worldliness to the apocalyptic writings which distinguish them from the more direct oracles of the earlier prophets. The apocalyptists are dependent, too, upon tradition, which is far from being the case with such exponents of the divine will as an Amos, an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, who speak with the assurance of messengers who have received an immediate commission from God. Another differentiating feature is the use of pseudonyms and the dream-vision. The pseudonymous character of the apocalyptic books has been a source of difficulty. This literature, as we have seen, is by no means destitute of real religious value. How is this fact to be reconciled with its pseudepigraphic character? How is the

[1] F. C. Porter, *op. cit.* p. 25 f.

fact to be explained that the writers of these books, who are obviously high-minded religious men, should have consistently put forth their writings under false names—e.g. the *Book of Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, etc. This, to us, strange procedure may largely be explained if we remember that these writers certainly drew their material from popular tradition. Many of the ideas which receive various embodiment in this literature were ultimately derived, doubtless, from the the common stock of the popular consciousness ; their ascription to or association with the great heroic figures of antiquity, like Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaiah, Elijah, or the Twelve Patriarchs, may also be a feature derived from the popular consciousness. The men who reduced the various elements to writing, or utilised them for enforcing particular religious lessons, may, on this view, be acquitted of any charge of fraud or dishonesty ; they implicitly trusted the popular tradition so far as to believe that the ideas to which they were giving expression really did go back to the heroic figures of old.[1]

The use of visions for conveying the revelation—visions usually preceded by a period (often of seven days) of preparatory fasting—is also, as has been pointed out, one of the characteristic features of apocalyptic literature generally, and differentiates it from the older prophetic literature. It is true that visions (e.g. Isaiah vi.) are to be found in the books of the older prophets, but only in a position of secondary importance. The tendency to assign the vision a more primary place asserts itself in Ezekiel, and the later prophetic literature (e.g. Zech. i.–viii.). In the apocalyptic literature the vision becomes the one recognised mode of revelation.[2]

[1] Cf. *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 36. A symbolic use of the names may also be allowed for, possibly.

[2] For a rather different view which emphasises the fundamental char-

The question has been much debated as to what value is to be attached to the apocalyptic visions as actual experiences. Some scholars have asserted the purely artificial and conventional character of these forms of revelation. It cannot be denied that there is often to be detected in these compositions an element which suggests careful construction and reflection, and they often possess marked literary affinities with older literature. But to admit this does not necessarily involve the denial of historical reality in a basis of actual experience. They may still reflect real experiences in the ecstatic state. The recipients of the visions were profound students of the older literature, and doubtless such study and reflection to a large extent determined, by way of suggestion, the form and content of the actual vision when it came. The most esteemed method of preparation for such ecstatic experiences was fasting. No doubt some of the visions are purely artificial constructions, built up on older models. But not all. Gunkel[1] regards the visions set forth in the Ezra-Apocalypse as reflecting real experiences.[2]

Lastly it is important to emphasise the wide philosophic outlook of the Apocalyptists. They were striving to frame a theory of the world which should account for all the facts of experience. They were thus driven to evolve a sort of philosophy of history. Their scheme was conceived on the grandest scale. It embraced not only the earth but the celestial sphere. History is surveyed from the beginning to the end—for the apocalyptists envisaged as an imminent

acter of the ecstatic element, even in the earlier canonical prophets, see the important article of Dr. T. H. Robinson, "The Ecstatic Element in Old Testament Prophecy," EXPOSITOR, March, 1921, pp. 217 ff.

[1] In Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, II. p. 340 f.

[2] See Box's *Ezra-Apocalypse*, p. lxvii., and for an admirable discussion of the whole subject cf. Porter, *op. cit.* pp. 24–43.

fact the end of the present age. Thus, to take an instance, the Ezra-Apocalypse begins its survey with creation (4 Ezra iii. 4 f.], not, as the prophets do, with the Exodus from Egypt, which marked the birthday of Israel as a nation (cf. e.g. Jer. ii. 2, Hos. xi. 1). The whole course of events is pictured dramatically ; the actors include not only men but the angelic and daemonic powers, all working under the control of God ; and the drama moves onward to the inevitable *dénoument*. Thus the apocalyptic literature may be regarded as the assertion of a profound belief that the course of human affairs is not purposeless ; what happens is not the mere result of the action and reaction of blind and uncontrolled forces. The sequence of events has a meaning. History is marching onward to a predestined goal. It is subservient to the will of a higher and moral Power ; and to this Power the evil forces of the world—which are dread realities to the apocalyptists—however victorious they may seem to be for a time, are in the end subordinated. This is rather an abstract way of describing the essence of what the apocalyptists envisaged as a living drama, instinct with life and crude imaginative power.

G. H. Box.

## *A NEW TURN IN JOHANNINE CRITICISM.*

SHORTLY before his death Dr. William Sanday wondered if after all he had not been too positive in his position concerning the Fourth Gospel. In *Divine Overruling*, p. 61, he says: "I'm afraid there is one important point on which I was probably wrong—the Fourth Gospel." Dr. Sanday was always candid and open to fresh evidence while at heart loyal to the truth as he saw it. He first won great fame by his luminous and able treatise in 1872 entitled *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel Considered in Reference to the Contents of the Gospel itself*. In this volume Dr. Sanday revealed the clear insight, the cautious temper, the comprehensive grasp that marked all his later productions. With fine poise he urged that "it is useless to point to the culture of the Greek, when beneath it there lies the indisputable stamp and character of the Jew" (p. 303). He concludes (p. 304): "The Gospel is the work of the Apostle, the son of Zebedee; it is the record of an eye-witness of the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, and its historical character is such as under the circumstances might be expected—it needs no adventitious commendation to make it higher." That was the verdict of the brilliant young scholar of Oxford whose star was already rising while the Cambridge trio (Hort, Lightfoot, Westcott) were in their glory. Dr. Sanday once told me that he considered Hort the ablest of the three. But Sanday was not necessarily bound to an opinion because he had previously advocated it. In 1905 Dr. Sanday (*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*) returns again to the problem of the Fourth Gospel and reviews with great care and fairness the vigorous con-

troversy of the generation before. He reviews the work of able defenders of the Johannine authorship like Zahn, B. Weiss, Luthardt, Ezra Abbott, Watkins, Lightfoot, Westcott, Drummond, and that of those who reject it like Wendt, Bacon, H. J. Holtzmann, Jülicher, Schmiedel, Wrede, Wernle, Loisy, Moffatt, McGiffert. Dr. Sanday in 1905 still holds to the unity of the Fourth Gospel and the probable Johannine authorship, though with nothing like the clearness and vigour shown in 1872. He is attracted by the view of Delff, Harnack, Schürer, and Dobschütz that the Gospel was the work of the Beloved Disciple who may have been the so-called Presbyter John, or some other disciple in Jerusalem, though Sanday sees difficulties in the way of that view and hopes that on the whole John the Apostle is the author in spite of the difficulties in the way. But Sanday's temper is seen in these words (p. 157): "I do not honestly believe that everything happened as it is, or seems to be, reported. But in saying this I must add that I also do not believe that, even if the argument were made good to the full extent alleged, it would at all decisively impugn the conclusion at which we have hitherto seemed to arrive—that the Gospel is really the work of an eye-witness and of St. John." So in Sanday we see the conflict of two generations reflected as in a mirror.

Some critics were beginning to look upon Johannine criticism as having settled the problem of the Fourth Gospel against the Apostle John. They were willing to admit a Johannine school or a disciple of John, but not the Apostle John as the real author. Charles is impressed by the resemblances in language and thought between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse which "point decidedly to some connection between the two authors. The Evangelist was apparently at one time a disciple of the Seer, or they were

members of the same religious circle in Ephesus" (*Revelation of St. John*, Vol. I, p. xxxiii.). Every scholar has noticed the smoothness of the language in the Gospel and the grammatical uncouthness of the Apocalypse, but the underlying likeness is also there, whatever the explanation.

For myself I have never been able to see the utter incompatibility of the same author for both books, provided difference in circumstances was allowed. If we dismiss the hypothesis of a separate John the Presbyter and make the Apostle and Presbyter John the son of Zebedee as Dom Chapman so ably argues (*John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, 1911), then it is hard to resist the conclusion that the John of the Apocalypse is the Beloved Disciple of the Fourth Gospel (Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 252). There is, to be sure, the dispute of whether John was put to death by the Jews on a misinterpretation of Origen (Hayes, *John and His Writings*, p. 132).

But scholars with lingering doubts on one side or the other of the age-long controversy have taken fresh interest in the book of Dr. C. F. Burney, Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford (*The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 1922). Critics had been emphasising the Hellenistic character of the Fourth Gospel (chiefly the Logos in the Prologue) and had overlooked the Semitic character of the language. "There are few Hebraisms in detail." "In the formal grammar the Greek is much like the vernacular (and literary) *κοινή*, but the cast of thought is wholly Hebrew." So I had written in my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, p. 133. There is a Semitic flavour in the Fourth Gospel that the Greek dress did not hide. The possibility that in the Apocalypse we have John's real style of uncouth Greek,

while in the Gospel his work has had revision had attracted me (*Ibid.*, p. 137). John and Peter are termed *ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται* by the Sanhedrin in Acts iv. 13. There is a slight hint at revision of the Gospel in John xxi. 24 in the use of *οἴδαμεν* by those who endorse the Beloved Disciple as the author of the book in contrast to *οἶμαι* in verse 25. But this view has been regarded as a rather desperate resort for those who are determined to cling to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

Lightfoot had already urged that the Fourth Gospel revealed distinct traces of Aramaic influence (*Biblical Essays*, 1893, pp. 126-144). "The Greek is not ungrammatical Greek, but it is cast in a Hebrew mould. It is what no native Greek could have written" (p. 135). Dr. Burney laments that the hint of Lightfoot was not taken up by New Testament scholars (p. 1). Other men had long ago suggested that the Fourth Gospel had an Aramaic original, but detailed proof was not forthcoming. Schlatter in 1902 *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelistes*) had demonstrated the Semitic character of the Fourth Gospel by citing Rabbinic parallels to the language of much of it (verse by verse). The trouble is that few New Testament scholars are experts in the Semitic languages. So Dr. Burney comes to the study of the Fourth Gospel from the Semitic side. This fact will be counted against him. Dr. James Moffatt is not impressed by the arguments for minimising the Alexandrian influences in the Gospel, but thinks that Dr. Burney's book will call attention to the Fourth Gospel along new lines (*The Hibbert Journal*, July, 1922, p. 783).

But Rev. L. W. Grensted is greatly impressed by Dr. Burney's stimulating suggestion ("New Light on the Fourth Gospel," *The Interpreter*, July 1922, pp. 263-9). He notes that since the time of Erasmus the Hellenists have had it

all their own way with the New Testament, but that now "all serious New Testament scholars must in the future know Hebrew and Aramaic, or, at least, walk humbly when the Semitist speaks" (p. 269). The New Testament as we have it is Greek, the current κοινή of the first century A.D. as the papyri prove. But it is impossible to cut the New Testament entirely free from its Semitic environment. We know that Jesus spoke Armaic to the usual Jewish people, bur probably Greek on occasion when in Greek-speaking communities. Mark translates some of the Aramaic sayings of Jesus into Greek. Papias states that Matthew wrote the Logia of Jesus in Hebrew (Aramaic), which each one translated as he was able. It is now maintained by many scholars that this was the Q of criticism, the non-Markan source common to our Greek Matthew and to Luke. Some scholars argue that Mark was first written in Aramaic. Translation from the Aramaic sources, therefore, undoubtedly played a considerable part in the preparation of our Gospels. Luke was probably a Greek, but in the Gospel i. 5 to ii. 52 he clearly made use of Aramaic sources either oral or written or both, with many earmarks of the Semitic original in sharp contrast with the literary introduction in i. 1-4. In the rest of the Gospel Luke has Semitic touches due either to the use of the Septuagint or to the Semitic material used by him. That is true also in the opening chapters of the Acts without accepting the view of Prof. C. C. Torrey that all of Acts i.–xv. is a translation from an Aramaic original. We now know that what Dr. James Hope Moulton called "Translation-Greek" is a much larger factor in the New Testament than he admitted. It is still clear that the New Testament was written in the current Greek of the first century A.D., chiefly in the vernacular, but with some distinctly literary portions. But it must not be forgotten that Jesus

lived in Palestine and read the Hebrew Old Testament and spoke the Aramaic as well as the *κοινή*. The people of Palestine spoke Aramaic and some of them used the Greek also. But the background of Christianity is Semitic, not Greek. Palestine was a Semitic patch in the Græco-Roman world. The language of the New Testament is good *κοινή*, but the authors of the Gospels and the Acts necessarily worked on Semitic materials. It is no less so of Paul who, though a Jew, wrote his Epistles freely without the use of sources save the quotations from the Old Testament (usually the Septuagint, though sometimes his own translation of the Hebrew). Charles has proven up to the hilt the Semitic character of the Apocalypse in conception and to a considerable extent in language. It is not necessary to go to the extreme that Charles does, and to make the Greek and grammar of the Apocalypse unlike anything in the world to see that it is Semitic in conception and style.

But Dr. Burney argues that in the Fourth Gospel the problem concerns Aramaisms, not Hebraisms. He thinks that the argument for the Aramaic original of the Fourth Gospel is much stronger than that for Mark's Gospel. Mark was Peter's "interpreter" and knew both Aramaic and Greek well, and may only preserve Aramaic touches in his Greek. The chief Aramaisms claimed by Dr. Burney may be given in broad outline. It is not practicable here to discuss the details given by Dr. Burney, some of which are much more striking than others. But the broad lines of his argument may be given. He urges (p. 49) that "it is highly characteristic of Aramaic to open its sentences abruptly without the use of a connecting particle," whereas asyndeton is uncommon in Hebrew and Greek. The Synoptic writers use asyndeton rarely; it is common in the Fourth Gospel. Parataxis (p. 56) is common to both Hebrew and

Aramaic, but the Fourth Gospel far surpasses the Synoptic books. "Sentences are regularly co-ordinated and linked by *καί*. Subordinate sentences are few and far between." The rarity of the genitive absolute in comparison with the Synoptic Gospels is noteworthy. Both Hebrew and Aramaic (p. 63) make frequent use of the *casus pendens*, much more common in John than in the Synoptic Gospels. This is not a very strong argument, as the form of anacoluthon is common in the vernacular of all languages. John makes infrequent use of *καί* in comparison with the Synoptists (p. 66) partly because of asyndeton and partly because of the excessive use of *οὖν* (200 times in John, 57 in Matthew, 6 in Mark, 31 in Luke). One of the most striking points made by Dr. Burney is the suggestion (p. 70) that the Aramaic *dĕ*, which has so many shades of meaning (that, who, which, when, in order that, inasmuch as, because), may lie behind the varied use of *ἵνα* in the Fourth Gospel and even of *ὅτι* (p. 76). He argues also (p. 87) that the historic present, so common in Mark (151 examples) and in John (164 examples, against 78 in Matthew partly same as in Mark, 4 or 6 in Luke) is due to the Aramaic idiom rather than to mere colloquial vivacity in Mark and John. Dr. Burney considers the most weighty form of evidence (p. 101) to be cases where the Aramaic and the Hebrew had different meanings or where the Aramaic was original. In John vii. 38 he holds that in the unvocalised text the Aramaic word for "fountain" and for "belly" would be identical. He suggests "fountain" as correct. He points to Matthew xxiii. 26, where *καθάρισον* corresponds to *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην* in Luke xi. 41. In Matthew we should have "Cleanse first what is within the cup," and in Luke "Cleanse what is within" (the cup) rather than "Give as alms what is within" (a very puzzling passage).

It is too soon to pass final judgment on the problem raised by Dr. Burney. But his solution at least challenges consideration. If he is right and the Fourth Gospel itself is early in its Aramaic form, we see an answer to the enigma connected with the famous Johannine passage in the Logia of Jesus (Q) which has so long puzzled critics (Matt. xi. 25-30 =Luke x. 21-22). The use of the "Son" and the "Father" in the earliest known document behind our Gospels is precisely of a piece with that in the Fourth and last of the Gospels. The genuineness of this type of teaching by Christ is greatly strengthened.

Once more, if the original of the Fourth Gospel was early (say by 75 A.D.) and by an eye-witness from Palestine, the book gains historical credibility as Westcott so ably argued. In that case Sanday in 1872 was nearer right than Sanday in 1905. And then the early date of the Synoptic Gospels receives fresh confirmation since the Fourth assumes their narrative.

It follows also that the difference in language between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse vanishes. "Thus it appears that the case against identity of authorship of the Gospel and the Apocalypse can certainly not be maintained on the ground of date. The evidence is all in the other direction" (Burney, p. 152). This is Dr. Burney's conclusion after giving a "rough list of Semitisms common to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse" (p. 150).

Dr. Burney is aware of the audacity of his theory: "If the theory is soundly based, it must surely effect something like a revolution in current Johannine criticism" (p. 126). The testing of time will tell how much of truth lies in this prophecy.

Dr. Burney holds to the unity of the Fourth Gospel and the identity of authorship with the Apocalypse. He believes,

however, that the John of the Apocalypse is the so-called Presbyter John of Papias and the Presbyter (the Elder) of the Johannine Epistles. Dr. Burney suggests (p. 149) that the Epistles were dictated to an amanuensis, who may have been the translator of the Gospel from Aramaic, as an explanation of the freedom from the solecisms of the Apocalpyse.

Dr. Burney presents no new arguments against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel except that it is unlikely that the unschooled fisherman of Galilee should show so much rabbinical knowledge as Schlatter has shown. But if the Aramaic Gospel was written about A.D. 75, that is forty years after A.D. 35, the probable time of the remark recorded is Acts iv. 13. The great knowledge of the Old Testament as shown in the Apocalypse is not inconsistent with full knowledge of the oral teaching of rabbis. Besides, much of this familiarity may be due to the teaching of Jesus. There is nothing whatever in the theory of Dr. Burney that rules out the Apostle John as the author of the Johannine books.

Dr. Burney argues that the Logos doctrine in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel may well be suggested by the language of the Targums, as is so ably shown by Dr. J. Rendel Harris, rather than directly from Philo. In that case the Hellenism of the Fourth Gospel disappears. It is quite worth while to ask if after all the strained effort to find Greek influence in the New Testament teaching does not sometimes blind one to the tremendous influence of the Hebrew Scriptures, the very breath of these writers. Paul and Luke and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews were certainly open to the influences of the Græco-Roman world, but not to the obscuring of Christ and of Christianity.

Synoptic criticism has shown the early date of Q and of Mark. Ramsay and Harnack have vindicated the historical

value of Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, a veritable "Revolution in New Testament criticism" as Dr. James Stalker has termed it. Would it not be the climax of this whole process if the Fourth Gospel should be shown to be early in its Aramaic original, to be Palestinian and Jewish and not Greek in thought and style, even in the end to be the work of John the Apostle? Stranger things have happened.

A. T. Robertson.

## *WRATH "UNTO THE UTTERMOST."*

It is a fortunate coincidence that the oldest of our New Testament writings should be at the same time the most precisely and certainly datable, and in addition one of the most indisputably authentic of the group to which it belongs, the Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.

Of the small group of extreme "liberal" critics of the school of Baur who a generation ago still entertained doubts of the authenticity of First Thessalonians none remain to raise a reasoned objection. Second Thessalonians is open to some doubt. The case against it is strong enough to forbid dogmatic utterance on either side. But only the freak criticism of the ultra radicals who admit no authentic Pauline writings at all attempts to bolster up a case against the earlier and larger member of the pair.

There has never been serious difference of critical opinion as to the relative date and place of writing of First Thessalonians. The author's own statement as to its occasion (1 Thess. iii. 1–10) falls in so closely with the situation described by the author of Acts (Acts xvii. 10–15; xviii. 5) as to leave no room for doubt that it was written from Corinth soon after Paul's first appearance there. The possible minor discrepancies with Acts as to the movements of Paul's companions, or the precise number of weeks or months spent by the missionaries in Thessalonica do not affect the main result. Even if conceded, they warrant nothing more of inference than the independence of the Lukan narrative, a confirmation rather than detraction from its essential trustworthiness. It follows that this Epistle is the earliest writing which we possess from the hand of St. Paul, the possibility of Galatians preceding it

by a few weeks or months being heavily discounted by the fact that no evidence appears of any perturbation of the writer's mind by the opposition of the Judaisers to his missionary work.

The criticism of Baur, which based a rejection of the Thessalonian Epistles mainly on the absence from them of that polemic against the Judaisers which distinguishes the four Major Epistles which followed, and which from the Tübingen view-point constituted the essence of Paulinism, is the best of evidence to the fact of difference. In this pair the restriction of doctrinal themes to a simple type of Son of Man doctrine, the only issue relating to a point of eschatology, has earned for them the somewhat ambiguous designation "Missionary Epistles." This restriction is hard to reconcile with the idea that Galatians had shortly preceded, and it is even more difficult on this supposition to account for the simple superscriptions (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). As we know, Paul's claim to the title "Apostle" is strenuously vindicated in Galatians. In every epistle thereafter it invariably appears. The only exception is the swan-song of Philippians, where the doomed "prisoner in Christ Jesus," writing to a Church which had never doubted him (Phil. i. 3), applies to himself and Timothy in common the title "slaves of Christ Jesus." If Galatians had just been despatched it is hard to believe that Paul would have superscribed both Thessalonian letters simply "Paul and Silvanus and Timothy." We should have expected at least the equivalent of Colossians i. 1. This, then, is our earliest document from the archives of the faith. For while certain modern attempts have been made (as much against the testimony of antiquity as against the internal evidence itself when rightly interpreted) to date one or more of the Gospels or of the Catholic Epistles at an

earlier time, sober historical criticism must take its stand upon First Thessalonians as the earliest writing of the New Testament.

Recent archaeological discovery has enhanced our interest in these beginnings of New Testament literature by adding the most important bit of chronological evidence yet obtained to determine not only the relative but the absolute date, and therewith of the whole chronology of the apostolic age. The facts of the case are succinctly stated by Frame in his admirable Commentary in the *International Critical* series (1912). After referring to the present writer's dating of the Epistle "early in the spring of 50 A.D." (Bacon, *Introd.*, 1900, p. 58), and comparing the slightly later dating of Turner, Frame continues :

> From an inscription in Delhi preserving the substance of a letter from the Emperor Claudius to that city (Corinth), Deissmann (*Paulus*, 1911, 159–177) has shown that Gallio took office in midsummer, 51, and that, since Paul had already been in Corinth eighteen months when the proconsul of Achaia arrived, the Apostle "came to Corinth in the first months of the year 50 and left Corinth in the late summer of the year 51." Inasmuch as Paul had probably not been long in Corinth before Timothy arrived, and inasmuch as the first letter was written shortly after Timothy came (1 Thess. iii. 6), the date of First Thessalonians is approximately placed in the spring of 50 and the date of Second Thessalonians not more than five to seven weeks later.

There are indeed few experiences which will go further to convince the traveller of the immeasurable debt owed by New Testament criticism to the kindred science of archaeology than to take his stand first in the museum at Delphi in front of the Gallio inscription discovered in 1905, and thence to betake himself to the more modest excavations of the Americans at Corinth, where in the similar smaller museum alongside the excavations he may gaze upon a broken lintel, bearing a rude inscription of about the period

of the Apostle's stay: *Συναγωγὴ Ἑβραίων*. The place where this stone was found near the principal street of the ancient city was almost certainly the site of that "Synagogue of the Jews" where Paul began his great work in Corinth (Acts xviii. 4). Taken together these two broken inscriptions enable us to place outselves both chronologically and geographically at the very spot and moment of time where New Testament literature began.

It is a matter of no mere idle curiosity to fix the date "spring of the year 50" for the earliest epistle of St. Paul. Accurate datings are of the utmost importance for those questions of historical circumstance and environment which constitute the chief field of modern inquiry, and have enriched New Testament interpretation with its greatest contributions in our generation. In such a passage as 1 Thessalonians ii. 14–16, where the Apostle complains of Jewish persecution, we have one of the clearest instances in the New Testament of direct reference to current events. The critic can ill afford to neglect these rare links of connexion, especially when (as in the present instance) the date and place of writing can be clearly and accurately fixed.

This is not a mere matter of apologetics or textual criticism. The authenticity of First Thessalonians is fortunately no longer in dispute. Doubt has indeed been expressed concerning the clause (1 Thess. ii. 16b) usually rendered "But the wrath (of God) is come upon them to the uttermost," on the assumption that we have here a reference to the catastrophe of the year 70—of course an anachronism in the life-time of Paul. But even were this translation correct (and it probably is not), only the clause itself could be rejected. The authenticity of the Epistle as a whole is guaranteed by its author's expectation of survival until

the Second Coming (iv. 17), which no later imitator would have put in the mouth of Paul.

But we must go further still. Both the Epistle as a whole is authentic, and the clause in question (against which not the slightest textual evidence can be alleged) must stand as it is in all the witnesses. Frame is indeed quite justified in his assertion that

> If the literal sense of ἔφθασεν ("is come upon," verse 16) is insisted upon, *and if of the many possible references to the past the destruction of Jerusalem is singled out*, then either the entire letter is spurious (Baur, *Paulus*,[2] II. 97) or the clause ἔφθασεν . . . τέλος is an interpolation inserted after 70 A.D. (*cf.* Schmiedel, *ad loc.* and Moffatt, *Introd.* 73).

But it is arbitrary to single out the destruction of Jerusalem as the reference in mind, instead of occurrences recent to a writer of 50 A.D. and quite as significant of the divine rejection of the Israelitish nation to a Christian writer of that date as those of 70 A.D. could be to later Christians. Such interpretation would show nothing more than incapacity to exercise a truly historical imagination. For nearly a half-century ago one of the greatest of the Tübingen critics could effectively correct in this respect the one-sided view of Baur. In his *Introduction* (1875, p. 243) Hilgenfeld declares :

> Paul has the Book of Daniel in mind (Dan. viii. 19 ; xi. 36 LXX) and could regard the loss of the political independence of the Jews, the yoke of heathen domination which they so bitterly felt, as their complete (national) destruction.

However, Professor Frame demurs to the idea that the loss of political independence incurred through the sudden death of Herod Agrippa I. in the summer of 44 A.D., or even the series of catastrophes of which it was the precursor in the three years which followed, can account for Paul's language. He does not even think that the Apostle

is referring to Israel's "complete (national) destruction." He would render εἰς τέλος "at last," and regard the use of the aorist ἔφθασεν as "proleptic." "The wrath" is that of the final judgment. It has not, then, actually broken forth. In iv. 15–17 the scenes of the consummation are expressly placed in the future. It is by a figure of speech that Paul "speaks of it as at last arrived." As von Dobschütz phrases it (who is followed by Professor Frame in this interpretation), "Paul here threatens with the last judgment, as an outpouring of divine wrath upon stiff-necked, unbelieving Israel. It must come soon, for the measure of sin is full." To Professor Frame the "naturalness" of a proleptic aorist in this passage is so apparent that the hypothesis of interpolation becomes "unnecessary."

There remains, however, no inconsiderable group of scholars who fail to recognise the "naturalness" of this reference to the wrath of God as already broken forth, when all that the writer has in mind is "the day of judgment which is near at hand." To these Professor Frame has reference in the words "If the literal sense of ἔφθασεν be insisted upon." Here lies indeed the only vital difference among interpreters. Whether we render εἰς τέλος "unto the uttermost" or "at last" is a question of relative unimportance, but Frame is almost certainly right. The "end" which Paul considers to have been reached is certainly not the end of the divine wrath, but of the divine patience. The Jews have been continually "heaping up the measure of their sins." In the language of Romans ii. 5 they have been "heaping up wrath against the day of wrath." Now the turning point has been reached. Such is the statement. But is this statement grounded on patent events, or only on the Apostle's personal conviction? Paul undoubtedly means that the measure of Israel's iniquity is now full, as

that of "the Amorite" had been when they were driven out of the land (Gen. xv. 16). The question of real significance is whether in making this assertion, and giving it the form of a direct statement in the past tense "the wrath (which they had heaped up) has come upon (or 'overtaken') them," Paul is speaking only from "moral" certitude. Has he, or has he not in mind certain conspicuous "signs of the times," which Christians might well regard as marking the final withdrawal of God's favour from Israel as a people? On this point the division of exegetical opinion is really significant.

We must acknowledge ourselves to be of the number of those who if they do not "insist upon the literal sense of ἔφθασεν" are at least unable to regard the figurative sense as so "natural" as to warrant the setting aside of the self-evident principle that the usual and literal sense must take precedence wherever possible. In support of the conviction that this literal sense is not only possible but far superior in significance to any mere "reference to the day of judgment which is near at hand" we have two considerations to offer, which have not to our knowledge been brought to the attention of interpreters: (1) Whatever the sense of its ending the passage begins (verse 14) with an unmistakable reference to recent historical events: "For ye, brethren, became imitators of the churches of God which are in Judaea in Christ Jesus; for ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen as they did of the Jews." (2) Whatever may seem to moderns the turning point in the national destinies of Israel, for ancient Christian thought the point of overflowing of Jewish "sin," visibly followed by divine "wrath," was not so much the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem (which to our amazement leave scarcely a ripple on the surface of contemporary and later Christian

literature), as what an ancient catena on the phrase "the wrath of God" in John iii. 36 designates "the successive punishments sent by God upon" the Jews in the disastrous years which followed the hey-day of their prosperity under Agrippa, persecutor of the Church.

Passover of the year 42, precisely twelve years after the crucifixion, marked an epoch in primitive Christian thought, because then under the leadership of "the Pharisees and Herodians" the iniquity of Israel became "full." Herod slew James the brother of John with the sword, and then, because he saw it pleased the Jews, proceeded to take Peter also. In Acts xii. the persecution and "driving out" of the Church are related by Luke, together with the awful fate visited upon the persecutor, immediately before his account of the First Missionary Journey. If in interpreting 1 Thessalonians ii. 16 we bear in mind these two things: (1) the context of the verse itself; (2) the context of current events as they are reflected in contemporary Christian thought, the usual and literal sense of the aorist ἔφθασεν ("hath overtaken") may well appear far more "natural" than any "proleptic" use of the past tense as a kind of figurative future.

To fully clear the ground of subsidiary questions we should not only admit to Professor Frame that "at last" is a better translation of εἰς τέλος than "unto the uttermost," but also that the clause "But the wrath of the Lord came upon them at last" in the majority of texts of Levi vi. 11 (*Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs*) quite possibly stands in real literary relation with 1 Thessalonians ii. 16. If such be the case we must regard it (with Burkitt) as "a Christian interpolation" (it fails to appear in the first Armenian recension). The supposition of dependence on the side of Paul (R. H. Charles) seems highly improbable.

It is possible, however, that the clause in Levi vi. 11 is authentic. If so the simplest explanation is that both Paul and the writer of the *Testaments* are using an expression which had become current through the influence of Daniel xi. 36. Professor Frame would seem to coincide with this judgment.

Returning now to the only really vital question in debate, let us free our minds of the preconceptions of the modern man, familiar from Josephus with the story of the horrors of the Jewish War and the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem. We must cease to think of these events of 66–70 as the tokens of Jehovah's complete displeasure with His disobedient people, and place ourselves at the point of view of Paul and his contemporaries, ignorant as to the darker fate still awaiting Israel, aware indeed from the predictions of Jesus that the time could not be distant when the "great buildings" of Herod must be overthrown to give place to a "temple not built with hands," but not necessarily taking this as the outbreak of "the wrath."

If we may take the little apocalypse which Paul quotes as "a word of the Lord" in 1 Thessalonians iv. 15–17 as one of the "revelations" given by "the Spirit of Jesus" to prophets such as Paul's companion Silas (Acts xv. 32) "to show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass" (Rev. i. 1), above all if we may add to this the supplementary item of the "man of sin" to be manifested "in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God" (2 Thess. ii. 1–12) as authentic with Paul, it will be quite apparent that the Apostle felt that the great dénouement was as yet only begun. The desecration which had befallen the sanctuary under Antiochus Epiphanes, and which only the assassin's dagger, smiting down the mad tyrant on the 24th of January 41 had prevented Caius from consummating

a second time, was to Paul's mind soon to be accomplished as a "mystery of iniquity" already at work.

In a word the decade 40–50 was the creative epoch of Christian eschatology. Paul and Silvanus have their exalted prophecies and revelations of the Spirit concerning the coming Wrath and the consummation of all things in the "gathering together of the elect." These are surprisingly prominent in the two "Missionary Epistles." But the predictions are not yet definitely connected with the siege of Jerusalem, the flight from the city, and the demolition of the temple. That is precisely what distinguishes this apocalypse from the apocalyptic chapter of the Synoptists. Mark xiii. 14 also speaks of the manifestation of "the abomination of desolation." But the evangelist, unlike Paul, avoids connecting it with the temple, and proceeds to describe the horrors of the siege and flight. Mark xiii. could be written by an author able to adapt the earlier eschatology to the actual events of 66–70. The Epistles to the Thessalonians could not. To Paul the "Mystery of iniquity" is already at work. The fate of Caligula has only momentarily averted the catastrophe. A few more years will see the Antichrist actually manifested "in the temple of God," to be followed by the "manifestation of the coming" of Jesus (2 Thess. ii. 8). The Gospel writers all know that this cannot happen in precisely the manner here foretold and make various modifications and adaptations of the prophecy accordingly. In substance the "prophecy" is the same. Christian apocalypse had already begun to assume a stereotyped form in the last years of Caius and the first of Claudius. Mark, Luke, and "Matthew" only revise and adapt.

But it is one thing to give warning of a future "Day of the Lord" that is coming "as a thief in the night," with

clear reference to the fate of believers and unbelievers as in 1 Thessalonians iv. 13–v. 11, and quite another thing to declare, as Paul declares in ii. 14–16, that the Jews by their hateful conduct have now reached the limit of the divine patience, that the measure of their sins is now full, and that " the wrath has overtaken them at last." For such a statement Paul's Jewish enemies at Thessalonica would be apt to demand some more definite and concrete evidence than the mere fact that from Paul's viewpoint they richly deserved it. Was the Apostle only " morally certain " ?

It has justly been observed that a very close parallel exists between the Pauline passage and Matthew xxiii. 32, " Fill ye up, then, the measure of your fathers," an editorial link by which the Palestinian evangelist binds together the Woe upon the Pharisees as builders of tombs for the prophets whom their fathers slew, and the quotation from " the Wisdom of God " denouncing the city filled with the blood of God's messengers (Matt. xxiii. 29–39). Paul thinks that his contemporary fellow-countrymen have now " filled up the measure " of their fathers' blood-guilt. He would have his Macedonian converts realise that the persecution they have endured from their fellow-Greeks has only repeated on a smaller scale the experience of " the churches of God which are in Judaea in Christ Jesus." " The Jews " had done enough now to " fill up the measure of their sins." Like Matthew he makes as his first charge that they had " slain the Lord Jesus and the prophets." In addition they had driven out " us " by persecution, which most commentators take to mean the three missionaries, though strictly speaking it was not " the Jews " who had driven out Paul and Silvanus and Timothy, certainly not the Jews of Jerusalem, but the Thessalonians' " own countrymen." In an

epistle which so largely reflects the standpoint of Acts (Paul's enemies not the Judaisers but "the Jews," his friends the undivided Church, his message the undifferentiated apostolic *kerygma* [cf. 1 Thess. i. 9 f. with Acts xvii. 24–31]), one may well query whether the "we" of this complaint against Jewish persecution may not be more comprehensive. May it not possibly be the apostolic "we" of 1 Corinthians xv. 11, or the comprehensive Christian "we" of Philippians iii. 3: "For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh"?

The decision of such questions must after all be according to the criterion to which Professor Frame has rightly appealed: What would have been "natural" for Paul under the circumstances? And to determine this the first step is to place ourselves so far as possible at the point of view of one of the persecuted brotherhood in the year 50 A.D. As we have seen above, Christian "prophecy" had not failed to place its own interpretation on the startling series of events which had ensued upon the assassination of Caligula at the moment when it seemed as if no human power could avert a repetition of the awful struggle against Antiochus to save Judaism from extirpation by force. The decade 40–50 was one of alternations for both Synagogue and Church from the depths of despair to the very heights of religious exaltation.

1. The Church in Jerusalem, which at this time (40 A.D.) had no thought as to the Pauline missions save to "glorify God" because the former persecutor "now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc" (Gal. i. 23), doubtless shared equally with the Synagogue, which had ceased all active opposition (Acts ix. 31), the frightful suspense which in the closing months of the year 40 made the long-threatened

horror of temple desecration seem inevitable, and led to the famous hunger-strike at Tiberias whereby the Roman proconsul Petronius himself was induced to intervene at the risk of his life against the design of Caligula. In vain had the philosopher Philo, at the head of a delegation of Jews from Alexandria, implored the madman to desist. Herod Agrippa, who had left Palestine in the spring without knowledge of the danger, learned of the emperor's design on meeting him at Rome shortly after his return in autumn from the German campaign, and risked the favour of his patron by a further attempt to intercede. For the sake of strictly impartial statement the sequel must be related in the language of our standard history of the times [1]:

> Contrary to all expectation, the letter of Agrippa had the desired effect. Caligula caused a letter to be written to Petronius, commanding that nothing should be changed in the temple at Jerusalem. The favour was certainly not unmixed; for along with this order there was an injunction that *no one who should erect a temple or altar to the emperor outside of Jerusalem* should be hindered from doing so. A good part of the concession that had been made was thus again withdrawn; and it was only owing to the circumstance that no one took advantage of the right thus granted, that new disturbances did not arise out of it. The emperor himself soon repented that he had made even this concession. He made indeed no further use of the statue that had been prepared at Sidon, but ordered a new one to be made in Rome which he intended himself, in his journey to Alexandria which he had in prospect, to put ashore on the coast of Palestine as he passed, and have it secretly brought to Jerusalem. Only the death of the emperor that soon followed (January 24, 41) prevented the carrying out of this enterprise.

For our better understanding of New Testament references to a setting up of "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet," whether as an inanimate

[1] Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People* (Engl. transl.), Div. I. vol. ii., p. 102. Italics ours.

object to be erected "in the holy place" (Matthew),[1] or as a person "in the temple of God" (2 Thess. ii. 4 ff.), or "where *he* ought not" (Mark), it is important to note that the danger was only temporarily averted. At any moment, as long as the temple stood, some enemy of the Jews might "take advantage of the right thus granted." Such was in fact the immediate occasion of the outbreak of the great war at Caesarea in 66 A.D. (Josephus, *War*, II. xiv. 4–6). Or a second Nero like Domitian might decree a shrine to his own divinity on the desolated "holy place," as Matthew seems to expect. All the reflections of this anticipated horror which the New Testament contains being of later date than 41 A.D. naturally appear in an adapted form. It never did happen in precisely the way it was expected to happen in the closing months of the year 40. But it did then become so inevitable that *something of the sort* would inevitably follow from the growing opposition between the demands of emperor-worship on the one side and Jewish fanaticism on the other, that the New Testament critic is forced to take careful account of the minutest changes of wording. For while we have not the actual "prophecy" on which the eschatological outlook of Paul in First and Second Thessalonians, of the Synoptic writers, and of the "John" of Revelation xvii. are primarily based, there is strong reason to believe that such a "word of the Lord," or prophecy uttered in the name of Jesus, was current in the Church (1 Thess. iv. 15). It doubtless had a genuine basis in authentic sayings of the Lord. After 41 A.D. various writers modify it according to their individual conception

[1] Matt. xxiv. 15. It is characteristic of our first evangelist to assimilate Old Testament references to the original. This accounts for the slight variation from Mark. Matthew expects a more literal fulfilment than Mark.

of the teaching on the one side and the course of events on the other.

From the nadir of despair the Synagogue in the year 41 was raised to the zenith of exultation. Agrippa, to whose intervention the Jews ascribed their deliverance, was the beau ideal of the Pharisees. A direct descendant on his mother's side of the ancient Hasmonean dynasty he made it the key-note of his policy to prove himself both Jew and Pharisee. Making the utmost of the aid he had been able to render at the accession of the feeble Claudius he obtained from him the title of King, and the ultimate restoration of the entire great domain of his grandfather Herod the Great. At his coronation in the temple at Tabernacles (October, 41) it might well seem to the Jewish people, and especially the Pharisees, that the national glory and independence of Maccabean times had been miraculously restored, together with the favour they had enjoyed under Alexandra. What policy indeed could be more certain to please on the one side all Pharisean devotees of the Law, and on the other Agrippa's Roman patrons jealous of messianistic agitation, than the stamping out of the sect of the Nazarenes? As we have seen, it was at the Passover of 42 that this policy reached its fullest expression. Having already slain James the brother of John with the sword, Herod "when he saw that it pleased the Jews" proceeded to take Peter also. Peter escaped, but the Church was "driven out."

Then came disaster upon disaster. In the summer of 44 a sudden stroke, as if by special act of God, put an end to the arrogance and the life of the persecuting tyrant. All the fair dreams of national independence under a Hasmonean king devoted to the Law and favoured by the Romans vanished in a night. The rebellion against Roman

control which had occurred after the death of Herod the Great "in the days of the census" was renewed with greater violence. The doomed land suffered first in 44–46 the horrors of civil war. The insurrection of Theudas was promptly suppressed by the armed intervention of Rome, whose bitter yoke was imposed with greater severity than ever before. In 46–47 there followed a famine so terrible as to leave its mark for generations afterwards. The special favour of Rome enjoyed under previous emperors gave place in 49-50 to an attitude illustrated by the decree of Claudius expelling the Jews from the imperial city. We may be sure the Jews elsewhere were made to feel how thoroughly the world at large agreed with Paul that they were "contrary to all men" (1 Thess. ii. 15). It may be, then, that Paul, writing in the opening days of the year 50, felt only "morally certain" that in filling up their sins alway by slaying the prophets and the Lord Jesus, and driving out "us," the Jews had at last incurred the wrath of God. But it must be admitted that the signs of the times, as Christian prophets were wont to read them in those days, gave a certain confirmation to this moral certainty.

2. However the matter may stand as regards Paul's feeling or lack of feeling for these "successive punishments sent by God upon the Jews," Church tradition, as reflected not only by Luke but by Christian sources more or less independent of Luke, leave us in no manner of doubt regarding Paul's fellow-Christians. They did not by any means wait for the great rebellion under Nero and the events culminating in the overthrow of Jerusalem and the temple in 66–70 to fully make up their minds that "the end" (*τὸ τέλος*) of the divine long-suffering with disobedient Israel had come, and "the wrath of God" was kindled

against His people. To them there was a definite date on which patience with Israel reached its limit, after which there remained only "the times of the Gentiles" before the final consummation in the Coming of the Son of Man. This turning-point at which efforts for the conversion of Israel as a people (of course not as individuals) might cease, and the missionary zeal of the Church be turned to "the Gentiles" was definitely fixed at "twelve years" from the crucifixion. The date is of course determined by the persecution of Herod, which included the martyrdom of James the brother of John, the imprisonment of Peter, and the driving out not only of this chief of the apostolic company (Acts xii. 17; cf. Gal. ii. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 5) but doubtless of many others. Some of the Pharisean converts among these exiles may well have become the opponents who at this time began their harassing counter-propaganda against Paul (Acts xv. 1).

It is not the least among several points of exceptional coincidence between Paul and Acts which characterise the two "Missionary" Epistles, that the Apostle should take a tone of relentless severity against "the Jews" as sole authors of opposition to the faith, "displeasing to God and contrary to all men." The contrast with later utterances calls for considerable application of the principle properly invoked by Frame.

The letters of Paul reveal not a machine but a man; his moods vary; now he is repressed (2 Thess. iii. 2 "faith does not belong to all"), again he is outspokenly severe (Phil. iii. 1 ff.), and still again he is grieved, but affectionate and hopeful (Rom. ix. 1 ff.; xi. 25).

Otherwise we could hardly accept the genuineness of a denunciation so unqualified as 1 Thessalonians ii. 15 f., wherein (as against Rom. ix.–xi.) no hope for the future of Israel is expressed. Are we to see in this the influence of

the "prophet" Silvanus, joint author of the letter with Paul (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1); or must it be ascribed with other peculiarities to the special pressure of the times? Either way the exception, while not sufficient to cast doubt upon the authenticity of the letter, is significant. Paul (or Paul-Silvanus) here comes close to Acts. And Acts does not stand alone. Clement (*Strom.* VI. v. 43) cites a fragment from the *Kerygma Petri*, a writing practically contemporary with Acts and at least in this particular independent of it, which gives as a word of the Lord the direction to the Apostles,

> After twelve years go forth into the world, that no man may say, We did not hear.

And the *Kerygma Petri* does not stand alone. In the *Acts of John* Mary dies in the eleventh year after the crucifixion, in the twelfth the Apostles leave Jerusalem *on the initiative of Peter*. The Coptic *Pistis Sophia* represents the Lord as remaining with the disciples for eleven years after the resurrection, and giving them a final revelation in the twelfth year. This is followed with some divergence by the *Papyrus Bruce*. Finally the *Acta Petri cum Simone* declares that

> After twelve years had been fulfilled, even the number which he (the Lord) had commanded him (Peter), the Lord Christ showed him a vision to this effect (that he should go to Rome).

The tradition of the twelve-year stay of the Apostles in Jerusalem is clearly in some sense "Petrine." It receives because of its antiquity and apparent independence of our Book of Acts a separate section in Harnack's *Chronologie* (1897, Vol. I. pp. 243 f.). Harnack is doubtless right as against von Dobschütz, the editor of the *Kerygma Petri* fragments, in maintaining that the datum is not irreconcilable with Acts. The real fact, as we have attempted

to set forth in a recent article,[1] would seem to be that the tradition was known to Luke and accepted by him; but that he does not date the actual "times of the Gentiles," signalised by the departure of Peter from Jerusalem and the First Missionary Journey (Acts xiii. 1 ff.), until *fifteen* years from the crucifixion. It is the death of Herod the persecutor in 44 A.D. and the ensuing famine in 46, which to Luke seems to mark the transition to the new epoch rather than the persecution itself in 42. Paul's missions are to him more important than the going forth of Peter "to another place."[2]

[1] See my article "The Chronological Scheme of Acts" in *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XIV. (April, 1921), and the note following.

[2] The Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Vol. II. Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; Prolegomena II., Criticism, Macmillan, 1922) have given to the present writer's argument (*Harvard Theological Review* for April, 1921, pp. 150 ff.) for a transposition by Luke of the two sections of his Petrine source represented respectively by Acts ix. 32–xi. 18 and xii. 1–23 the high commendation of making it "the point of most importance" for Luke's rearrangement of his material (p. 174). In the special section devoted to the question on pp. 156 ff. it is shown in fact that the proposal (which the Editors provisionally adopt) vitally affects the problem of the nature and purpose of that "Petrine" or Caesarean source (Lake, "the Jerusalem tradition") which forms the backbone of Acts i. 12.

The article in question makes it sufficiently clear that the two sections *taken in reversed order* form a Judaean-Petrine parallel to the Antiochian-Pauline account of how "God sent this salvation to the Gentiles," both accounts relating settlement of the attendant issues by Apostolic conclave at Jerusalem (xii. 1–23; ix. 32–xi. 18 = xi. 19–26; xiii. 1–xv. 35). The article also explains *the reason for the transposition*, and the accompanying editorial additions in xi. 27–30 and xv. 6–11 (cf. xxi. 10 ff. and xi. 1 ff., $\beta$ text). By no other conceivable device could Luke have harmonised the conflicting claims of the Judaean Church through Peter, and Antioch through Paul, to be the mother Church of Gentile Christianity. Luke's adjustment involved a misdating of the well-known famine of 46 A.D. (xi. 27–30), and a proleptic intervention of "Agabus," the prophet whose *original* appearance as a resident of Judaea coming down to warn Paul at Caesarea was related in the We-source (xxi. 10 ff.). Luke's confusion may be partly due to the same misunderstanding of xii. 19 ff. which the Editors themselves betray. Contrary to their statement (p. 156, note 2) Eusebius is quite correct in placing the departure of Peter

The "Petrine" tradition, which pivots upon the crisis of the year 42, is older than the present form of the Book of Acts. It gives us a date of the utmost importance confirming that which by recent calculations of great exactitude [1] has been made most probable for the crucifixion, viz., 30 A.D. This date of Passover 42 for the persecution of Herod, the "driving out" of the Apostles, and the beginning of "the times of the Gentiles" "twelve years" after the resurrection can fortunately be controlled with certainty. It is not indeed susceptible of proof that Paul in his denunciation of "the Jews" as guilty of the persecution of "the churches of God which are in Judaea in Christ Jesus" and "forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles," when he declares that "the wrath of God has overtaken them at last" because "the measure of their sins has been filled full" has any thought of contemporary events. The

"in the year 42 A.D." The closing paragraph in the story of Herod's persecution and fate (Acts xii. 1–23) properly begins where the division is placed in the most ancient texts, viz., with 19b. An interval (two years) elapses after 19a. The story is resumed in ix. 32 at the point where dropped in xii. 17. Hence Lake's "xii. 1–17."

Since the importance of the proposed transposition for the source-criticism of Acts is recognised by the Editors of *Beginnings*, we cannot but regret that in their apparent adoption of it they should have seen fit not only to present it in mutilated form, but actually to omit all reference to its source or authorship. Later on, in another connexion (p. 177, note 1), the article which proposes it is mentioned, but without reference to the transposition problem. Since in the earlier and principal discussion (pp. 156 f.) there is no mention of previous authority or indication that the proposal is borrowed, the reader cannot but infer from the impersonal introductory phrase, "It may be legitimate to suggest," that the "suggestion" is the Editors' own, and that they are to be credited with "the point of most importance" for the problem of Luke's rearrangement of his material.

[1] See *Journal of Philology*, Vol. xxix., art. "The Date of the Crucifixion," by J. K. Fotheringham. The date previously advocated by Turner (Hastings, *D.B.* s.v. "Chronology"), viz., 29 A.D., has the support of second-century tradition but is astronomically inadmissible. It seems to rest upon attempts made in the period of the Paschal controversy (150–200) to calculate back by the succession of Passovers.

possibility will always remain open to the cautious interpreter that the Apostle is using the past tense "proleptically" and has reference only to the final judgment which he is sure on moral grounds will in due time overtake stiff-necked Israel. However, there will probably be also a considerable number of critics and interpreters who will "insist on the literal sense of ἔφθασεν." If this be our conclusion the consequences will not be small. The background of coincidence between the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, with their peculiarities of eschatology as well as other points of view, and the tradition traceable in Acts and elsewhere of the great crisis which came upon "the churches of God in Judaea" in the year 42, will have much to tell us on some difficult points of criticism. Not chronology alone will be concerned, but the complex problem of apocalyptic "prophecy" both in the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Revelation.

B. W. Bacon.

## *ANTONIO FOGAZZARO.*[1]

It was generally believed that during the present Pontificate the activities of the Inquisition, in which Congregation that of the Index has recently been merged, would have been discouraged. The election of Benedict XV. was the result of a reaction against his predecessor; the new Pope had been a pupil of the statesmanlike Cardinal Rampolla, and was supposed to have inherited something of the wisdom of Leo XIII. But Rome is a centre where cross-currents meet; and, though during the war the Curia was occupied with more burning questions than those of "heretical pravity," two recent condemnations, the one that of a professor, the other that of a biography, show that the spirit of Pius X., if enfeebled, survives. The excommunication of Professor Ernesto Buonaiuti, who occupies the chair of History of Religion at the University of Rome, for treating the doctrine of Transubstantiation on mystical lines, was not wholly unexpected; and its significance is rather technical than general. The condemnation of the *Life of Antonio Fogazzaro* by a distinguished Milanese writer, Conte Tommaso Gallarati-Scotti, is an event of greater importance. A biography is not ordinarily regarded as matter for condemnation; and a layman, particularly a layman of the writer's reputation, is seldom condemned. It is, perhaps, a sign of grace that the Holy Office should be of opinion that, with regard to the persecution—no milder word can be used—of Fogazzaro by the ecclesiastical authorities, least said is soonest mended. But it is to be

[1] *La Vita di Antonio Fogazzaro.* Tommaso Gallarati-Scotti. Milano: Casa Editrice Baldini e Castaldi. 1920. Lire 12. Translated by Mary Prichard Agnetti (Hodder & Stoughton, 15*s.*), 1922.

regretted that it has failed to learn by experience that the suppression of facts is impossible ; like murder, they " will out." And even devout Catholics have ceased to take the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* very seriously. A religious, it is said, recently asked his superior for permission to read a condemned book. " At Rome it is impossible," was the answer ; " go to Frascati, and read it there."

Fogazzaro stands nearly, if not quite, in the first rank of Italian novelists ; if he fell short of genius, he possessed a singular combination of talent and charm. His art is one of self-portraiture : he was introspective to the verge of morbidness, and beyond it ; he dwelt within. His biographer has caught this interior note : the Life is " a call to inwardness, addressed to a generation which lives increasingly on the surface of things." Its psychological insight is exceptional : it is essentially a study of temperament ; and of a temperament less uncommon than we might suppose. This temperament is not one which makes for happiness. Fogazzaro was a man of excessive sensibility : his imagination, his nerves, his senses, were too susceptible for equilibrium ; his life was one of oscillation ; he wandered, not between two, but between many worlds. His was " the intimate tragedy of a soul in search of God " : and *inimici hominis domestici ejus ;* one, at least, of the causes of his unrest was the facility with which he contracted a succession of friendships into which, platonic as they were, the element of sex entered. His biographer describes these as *tepidi adulteri spirituali*. They did not make him less devout ; the ardours of sense and spirit are often akin. But their very ineffectualness accounts both for his persistent physical and mental disquietude, and for the minor key in which his art is set. He was incapable of the robust *pecca fortiter* of the Reformer. But

the *musica proibita* of the danger-zone haunted him; he could not break away from the haunted shore.

The religious tradition in which he had been trained was that of Rosmini, still a power for good in Lombardy. This remained fundamental for him; what was added being superstructure. There could have been no better or more solid foundation. The *Cinque Piaghe della Chiesa* is its fullest expression; the author of this famous book, who united religion at once with patriotism and with learning, found the actual, as distinct from the ideal, Church wanting in all three qualities; and, while venerating the Papacy, both as the centre of unity and as the historical inheritance of Italy, his school set itself against the Temporalism of the Curia, its spirit of intrigue, and its narrow moral and intellectual horizons: it desired a spiritual religion, a learned priesthood, and an Apostolic Pope. Benedetto's discourse to the Pontiff, in *Il Santo*, is Rosminianism pure and simple; there is not a word in it which Rosmini might not have, and indeed had not already, said. A Rosminian, then —and Fogazzaro was rather a Rosminian, or Liberal Catholic, than a Modernist—had little to unlearn. His faith went through a period of eclipse; this was a note of his generation: but, when he emerged, religion was his passion; he was possessed by "the nostalgia of God." His novels are fragments of autobiography; he is Silla, Cortis, Maironi: the artist and the mystic, the sinner and the saint. "Each is in turn a moment in an interior romance, that of his own life; a confession, opening with *Malombra*, and closing thirty years later with *Leila*, in which he records his loves and his sufferings, his most intimate relations with women, his highest aspirations after God."

Essentially a visionary, he lived, like Goethe, in the totality of things. For him the world had no hard and

fast divisions: he felt the oneness of life in men and in Nature; and saw the marvel of the universe with the eyes of the writer of the *Benedicite*, or of the Franciscan Canticle of the Sun. The controversies with which his name is associated presented themselves to him primarily as religious, and only secondarily as critical and historical. He was inclined to press this distinction to a point at which it broke down; for, in the ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy, he was on the poet's side. And his Liberalism was one of temperament—hence its limitations; he followed where his heart rather than the thought led.

The poems of his earlier years, though pleasing, did not rise above mediocrity; it was not till middle life that he found the real vehicle of his art. This was that of romance. In 1881 he brought out his first novel, *Malombra*, between which and *Il Santo* (1905) came *Daniele Cortis*, *Il Mistero del Poeta*, *Piccolo Mondo Antico* and *Piccolo Mondo Moderno*, *Leila* being the last. Each of these represents some four or five years' labour; his works were "the fruits of a mature and rich nature, not the windfalls of a mere literary trick." He approached art as a vocation, and came to it as a priest to the altar. For him it contained an element of sacrifice; a man of his fine quality does not easily or lightly give himself away. "A poet is a teacher, or he is nothing," was a saying of Wordsworth; and Fogazzaro was of this mind. His conception of a literary career was that of a vocation, not of a pose, or trade.

Like Wordsworth, with whom he had much in common, though the high peace of the author of the *Excursion* was not his, he was *felix opportunitate*. After the heroic effort of the *Risorgimento*, Italy was the victim of a reaction not unlike that under which England is suffering to-day. There was a general lowering of standards. The quick-

change artist, adroit, versatile, unscrupulous, had replaced the statesman and the soldier: political and financial adventurers, lawyers and journalists on the make, *arrivistes* of every type with doubtful pasts and speculative futures, were the successors of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour. Here was the cancer of the State; the Church, decadent herself, was powerless against it: "entre une religion inintelligente et un matérialisme brutale, âme poétique et pure, où serait ta place?" His aim was to unite the better elements in the nation against the baser; and he discerned the ideal Church under the disguise of the actual: the heart of Italian religion, he believed, was sound. In this connexion the sketches of Cardinal Capecelatro, "the last of the Guelfs"; of Bishop Bonomelli of Cremona, "the embodiment of the union between religion and love of country"; and of Leo XIII., who was in the succession of the greater Popes—and of whom it may be said:

Sublatum ex oculis quærimus invidi—

are illuminating. These great men were not Modernists; it would be an anachronism to think it—they were of a former age. But they were men of open mind and large heart: they had the *flaire* of the eternal, and discerned the mind-movement in thoughts that were not their own. With rare exceptions, "a mysterious law seems to exclude such characters from office in the Church"; and the more democratic society becomes, the more this is so: those who share the limitations of the multitude are its favourite guides. Nor should such portraits as that of Carducci, "the rude, but honest and virile opponent of Christianity"; of d'Annunzio, "incapable either of love or suffering"; of Pascoli, "whom Dante would have placed in the *Limbus Infantium*," be forgotten. The lines are few; but the likeness is caught to the life.

As a controversialist—a character which he would have disclaimed—Fogazzaro was, in a sense, an amateur. His studies had not been those of an expert; he rather felt than knew. But he had the poet's vision, and the artist's power of expression; and those gifts placed him in the front rank of the Liberal movement in Catholicism; it is probable that *Il Santo* made more converts to Modernism than even M. Loisy's *petits livres rouges*. For:

> "Truth embodied in a tale
> May enter in at lowly doors":

he spoke to men and women in their own tongue, reproducing their varying moods, to which the self-contained austerity of the critic is foreign, and in which two or more divergent lines of thought lie side by side unreconciled. Such e.g. are impatience of, and submission to, authority; the question of the legitimacy of the authority was one which he did not raise. It is one, however, which, though it may be postponed, cannot be evaded. No one will suspect the distinguished author of this Life of any undue leaning to compromise: the difficulty is in the position; there are questions which, whatever the character and weight of the evidence, can be answered only in one way by a Catholic who is so more than in name. He must come to some kind of terms with the Pontifical Acts of 1907—i.e. the Decree *Lamentabili*, the Encyclical *Pascendi*, and the Anti-Modernist oath: and he can only do so either by minimising these pronouncements; or, like the wolf in the fable, by throwing the responsibility for them on their victims. The apology offered here for those Acts is that "they reaffirmed the realistic dualism which is of the essence of Christianity"—the author is silent as to the enormous superstructure of falsehood raised on this metaphysical foundation; and that they "brought to light the superficiality and unreality

which, particularly in Italy, were undermining religion" —nowhere so actively or so conspicuously as in the Rome of Pius X.

He is severe on the *imprecisioni dei preti modernisti;* and, in particular, on their *anonimato:* they were not saints. Probably they were not: "I hope that I am not humble," said Father Tyrrell, "from what I have seen of humble men." But they were better and more honest men than the secret agents of the Vatican, than the organisers of a press of which it could be said *non e affatto cristiana;* than the *gruppo terribile* to which the reek of the Inquisition—*l'odore del Sant' Uffizio*—clung. It was a mean and squalid persecution, which poisoned society, family life, the very confessional.[1] In a recent novel[2] a distinguished French writer has described its backwash in the seminaries; and it was the more hateful because it claimed to be exercised in the interests of religion, and in the name of Christ. Of the policy of non-resistance, which (it is sometimes urged by pietists) should have been adopted by Liberals, it is enough to say that, were it carried out in human affairs, society would become the prey of the criminal classes. And the charge of "intellectualism" rests on a palpable fallacy. The propositions condemned by Pius X. are, no doubt, in themselves morally indifferent: neither, if we maintain them, are we the better; nor, if we repudiate them, are we the worse. But it is another thing when we are called upon to accept the Pontifical Acts of 1907 as embodying truths of faith demanding interior assent. This is not a thing morally indifferent: the dilemma in which Loisy and Tyrrell were placed was that they had to choose between excommunication and what they knew—and they

[1] *The Saint.* English Translation. Pp. 153, 154, 344, 258.
[2] *L'Anathème,* par Albert Audin. Libraire P. Ollendorff, 1921.

had the educated mind of Europe behind them—to be a lie. To speak of their "gradual withering," and of the "ice of a dissolving individualism," is sophistry. Fogazzaro saw more truly and spoke more wisely when he said that, "had the prudence and charity of Leo XIII. been inherited by his successor, these distinguished men would not have been lost to the Church." It is lamentable to think of his sensitive soul deprived of the sacraments by what his biographer characterises as "the murderous spirit of orthodoxy." Even in that iron time four cardinals expressed their sympathy; but they were powerless; the victim looked forward to Purgatory, "where at least," he said, "there was neither Syllabus nor Pope."

It was less, however, to the tyranny of the Vatican than to the indifference of public opinion to the whole controversy that the Modernist débâcle of 1907–8 was due. This was the Achilles' heel of the movement; as it had been of Jansenism, of Gallicanism, of the Reformation in the Latin countries, and of every attempt to reform Catholicism from within. Is such a reform possible or conceivable? it is asked; or must new wine be put into new bottles, if the bottles are not to be burst and the wine spilled? The answer seems to be that the long clericalising of Catholicism, the belief that the Church is "the Pope's house," and religion the affair of the clergy—a thing to be taken, or left, but not thought out, being, according to the view taken, either too sacred or too trivial for rational treatment—this has made a gulf between the Church and the lay mind; the two think different thoughts and speak different tongues. In his notable essay on Lamennais, M. Émile Faguet argues for the impossibility of any concordat between the Church and Liberalism. Such a Concordat, he urges, would involve not merely a modification of doctrine—such modifications

have taken place in the past, and may again take place in the future—but (what is very much more radical) a change of outlook and orientation. *Sint ut sunt, aut non sint,* said a Jesuit, when the opponents of the Society proposed changes affecting its distinctive genius. The Catholic may make the same answer to those who would establish a *modus vivendi* between the Church and the modern mind-movement: were this effected, the sufficient reason of Catholicism would disappear. From the first Latin Christianity has embodied two principles—that of authority, and that of resistance to change. Both are essential to society. But "strife is the father of all things": unless they are balanced by their opposites, the result is stagnation; movement is excluded, the tidal ocean becomes a dead Sargasso Sea. This temper, or character—the word being used in its theological sense—was imprinted on the Christian community at Rome from birth. It is unmistakable in the letters of Clement to the Corinthians, in the dealings of Victor with the Asian, and Stephen with the African, Churches: it was the protective armour with which Western Christianity was equipped for its mission to the new and formless peoples which were to over-run Europe and to bring about the fall of the old Roman world. "Whose mouths must be held with bit and bridle": there was a time when the Papacy was what the Empire had been—the schoolmaster of the nations; a civilising force among uncivilised men. But this time passed; and the qualities which had been its strength became its weakness: in the sixteenth century the long ferment of the Mediæval Church burst the restraints of the organism, and the active elements broke away. In the countries which embraced the Reformation bridges were built—not, it must be admitted, without difficulty—between reason and religion: in those which re-

mained Catholic the rift between the two developed into a permanent estrangement—" between us and you there is a great gulf fixed." It is difficult to think that the breach can be healed. A Liberalised Catholicism would not only fail to appeal to the intellectual and cultural levels which Romanism now attracts—those who desire mental and moral tutelage ; temperamental minors, who will not think, and " cannot bear to doubt " ; it would repel them : the hierarchy would become atrophied ; " Othello's occupation would be gone." No Church which is still a political and moral force—and the Church of Rome will long remain both—will consent to abdicate in this way. And when Pius IX. condemned the proposition that " the Roman Pontiff could, and should, reconcile himself with modern civilisation," his meaning was in substance that of the historian who reminds us that while " lesser Churches may repent and amend, for Rome reform is suicide." The advances made from time to time by the Church to Democracy should not be taken seriously, and constitute no exception to the rule. For they are opportunist, and made only when the old monarchies have broken down. It would be unwise for the modern State to trust them. The Catholic conception of a democracy is, as we see in Ireland, that of a peasant community isolated from European culture, and governed by priests. This was why the defeat of Modernism was a foregone conclusion ; its climate was not one in which Catholicism could live.

And now the world in which these dreams played their part is shattered ; those who dreamed them are dead or dispersed—the vision is broken. The movement, it is true, was *una crisi non risolta* ; a crisis of feeling and thought, of doubt and disquietude, not resolved. But the next stage of the religious synthesis, now overdue, must subsume

it; for facts are facts, and, if we expect it to prove other than a mixed magnitude, we shall be disappointed; the human vehicle remains human; the Divine light never descends unclothed. And *tua res agitur cum proximus ardet*. When the ship of Peter is in perils by water, the Reformed Churches must go warily if they would weather the storm. Neither the baser elements of religion which came to the front under Pius X., nor their representatives, are wanting among us, though, as the field on which they are at work is insular, not European, their activities are restricted, and their personalities are on a smaller scale.

ALFRED FAWKES.

## *SOME NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS* (*Concluded*).

For when John appeared upon the scene, he appeared as suddenly as his mighty prototype, Elijah, born and bred no less than he to the manner of the prophet. But although he appeared so suddenly, yet he did so only when he had grown strong—strong in the strength of an unearthly might—and was ripe for the charge which grew with his strength. Hence there was no kind of breach between the new scene and the old solitude. The one was but the expansion or fulfilment of the other. What was personal to begin with had worked out inevitably into what was social or redemptive in the end, as with all the prophets. "For their sakes they sanctified themselves." The conquest of self issued in the combat and the cry on behalf of the kingdom of heaven. In emerging from the wilderness John bore in his body the marks of the wilderness, and was dedicate as there to the rites of fasting and of prayer. His scanty fare consisted as before of locusts and wild honey: "for he came neither eating nor drinking" (Matt. xi. 19). And as for his dress, it was but an ordinary garment woven of camel's hair girt with a leathern girdle such as the poor and prophets wore (Zech. xiii. 4). A poor man lonely and austere, content to suffer hardship in the wake of destiny, constant to the prime care of his moral being, all his lifetime lifting up his soul to God and to His "perfect" law of repentance, self-denial and obedience, and growing strong and stronger as the "end" of all these things drew near—such was John, the same man outwardly as inwardly, one with himself alike when preaching in the Jordan valley and when lodging and listening in the wilderness.

But the crowning thing about this man when he appeared was that, so far from being any mere enthusiast of the wilds, an Essene, or a devotee of any other local cult, he appeared as the prophet—prophet and patriot in one—after an interval of long duration in which no voice like his had spoken, or been suffered to speak aloud. There had been voices within the pale of Israel speaking ever and anon, fraught with wisdom and with counsel as of old, and with fresh and vital truth as well, but they were all or nearly all anonymous, or bore the borrowed names in which the speakers hid their own. Various reasons have been offered to account for this strange impersonal mode of thought and speech which prevailed for many generations, and left behind it "stores" of truth both old and new.[1] But with the advent of the Baptist there began an era continuous with, and yet far in advance of the prophetic and apocalyptic eras of the past. For here was a man who knew his time and the greatness of the issues which it bore, and who came forward in his own person, wearing neither mask nor mantle of another, and speaking "the word in season" which rang from the depths of his soul no less than from the depths of heaven itself. The newness of the time burst into life in that unwonted voice. It awoke the voices of ancient times. It was lift up with "the spirit and power of Elijah." It swept through the land in the burning tones of Amos. But it did more than revive the voices of the prophets, it restored the vision of the kingdom which nameless seers had foretold. If it be true that "what's past is prologue," then the past as a whole led up and served to usher in that "living thing" (Heb. iv. 12)—the word of God—which came to the man who was "more than a prophet." John combined the prophet and apocalyptist, and at the same time was more

[1] R. H. Charles, *Between the Old and New Testaments*, Chap. I.

than both in his person as in his prophecy: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near" (Matt. iii. 2).

No doubt these words as summing up his prophecy are found in Matthew alone, whereas in Mark and Luke there is a somewhat different form of words in which they agree to the effect that "he preached a baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins" (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3). To account for the difference, some will have it that Matthew suppressed the clause "for the remission of sins," looking to the fact that Jesus came to be baptized, and transferred it to its prime connexion with "the cup of the new covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 28). And as regards the statement of Mark which is followed by Luke, it is suggested that "he assimilated John's Baptism to the Christian rite with which he was acquainted." But one would suppose that if the alleged motive of Matthew applied to the clause which he omits it would equally apply to the clause which he retains, seeing that sin, in some sense, if not also its remission (ἄφεσις), are inseparable from *Μετανοεῖτε*. As for the idea of an assimilation of the baptism of John to the Christian rite, that seems to be unnecessary considering its own significance, the signal purpose which it served within his ministry. For the fact that John achieved the title of the Baptist, ὁ βαπτιστὴς, shows that his baptism belonged to his preaching or his principle as much as to his person, and his principle—the ῥῆμα θεοῦ—is not so wholly obscure as that it cannot be known in part. Even if it be "one of the most obscure of all the obscure subjects in the New Testament, the nature of the baptism introduced by John," yet, surely, the principle behind it, its *raison d'être*, in one point, at least, is more or less clear. It was the accompanying sign or, rather, seal of an inward change consisting in repentance or return. As a prophet, not to

speak of being more than a prophet, John would not be doubtful of the kind of attitude which was required of men in view of the judgement, " the Wrath to come," an attitude apart from which the rite itself had been of no avail, and would never have secured him the name of " the Baptist." Even Josephus in his slight but invaluable allusion to the man " that was called the Baptist," declares that " he commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism ; for that the washing [with water] would be acceptable to God, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away [or the remission] of some sins [only], but for the purification of the body ; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness " (*Ant.* xviii. 5, 2).

So far as the main point is concerned, this is in striking agreement with the burden of John's discourse, some fragments of which are pieced together in Matthew iii. 7–12, where it is prefaced by the statement, " when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to the baptism." The singling out of the Pharisees and Sadducees as though they alone were liable to the judgement is, no doubt, characteristic of Matthew and the anti-Jewish strain which runs through his gospel, while the mention of " the multitudes " in the parallel report of Luke (iii. 1–17) is, no doubt, equally characteristic of him.[1] As, obviously, it is but the substance of John's preaching that is preserved in either gospel, it is not impossible to suppose that what the preacher said to all on more than one occasion (ἔλεγεν = " he used to say," Luke iii. 7), he may have said to some once for all (εἶπεν, Matt. iii. 7). Here, however, it is more than prob-

[1] On Luke's tendency to minimise anti-Pharisaic controversy see *Oxford Studies*, pp. 70–71.

able that Luke has sensed the true historic situation, and is right in representing John as preaching not to the few but to the many, and this is implied in Matthew iii. 5–6. But the significant thing is that both evangelists agree in setting forth the inwardness of the baptism which John proclaimed. The multitudes according to the one, the Pharisees and Sadducees according to the other, supposed that the rite itself would confer a benefit, escape from the coming Wrath, independently of their moral state. Hence John, "as holy as severe," confronts them and demands, "Who suggested to you to flee from the Wrath to come?" The mere baptism, he says, will not avail. You must show by a better life that your repentance has been more than outward. As Montefiore truly says, "this is sound, prophetic, and also Rabbinic doctrine. When, however, John goes on to represent the Pharisees as saying: 'Our mere Abrahamic descent is enough to save us,' it would appear as if, in reality, he had urged those who despised his baptism, and regarded the summons to repentance as unnecessary (because their mere Jewish blood secured their safety), to forego their false confidence, and to be baptized and to repent. For, like Amos, John argues that God can reject His people. He can, in His omnipotence, make a new people out of stones. Anyhow, the Judgement is imminent, and its methods will be irrespective of race. Only those whose lives are good will escape 'eternal fire.' This warning . . . renewed the teaching of the eighth-century prophets." [1]

Thus the evangelists, while they vary in some points, are at one with each other and with Josephus in the main point, that the baptism which John insisted on was of the essence of his preaching, and was conferred upon those who

[1] *The Synoptic Gospels:* C. G. Montefiore, vol. ii., p. 463.

took his warning, and sought the word of God at his mouth. It not only signified but sealed their initiation to a higher mode of life. While the rite was meaningless apart from the reality spoken of by John (cp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25), the reality was incomplete without the rite. The rite had a rôle of its own to serve and was vital to the efficacy of the whole transaction as John conceived it—a fact that is confirmed, as one may think, by the pregnant question of Jesus : " The *baptism* of John, was it from heaven, or from men ? "

But what seems to have made the whole transaction something of a new beginning, and original to John, was that he combined it first of all with the coming of the kingdom, which meant for him the coming of a crisis in the national life. It has already been observed that John revived the apocalyptic vision with which nameless seers had striven to comfort and inspire the minds of their countrymen, and while, therefore, there may have been nothing unfamiliar in his doctrine of the future—a doctrine which prior to him was much more than " largely a literary tradition tied up in ingenious symbolism " [1]—the fact that he came forward as a prophet, and preached it as the word of God to the masses of the people, would charge it with a freshness and power which it never had before, and make it, like himself, a burning and a shining light. And when we read of the great conventicle at the Jordan we cannot but infer that his message, with its threefold note of appeal, good tidings and reproof (Luke iii. 18–19), not only sank into the ears of a well instructed people, but evoked an active sense of their own responsibility. Their flocking out to his presence and his preaching proves that the vision of the kingdom, from being a more or less consoling prospect

[1] *Foundations*, p. 93.

of the future, had been transformed into a constraining precept of the present. The soothing promise of the time to come had suddenly in that voice of his crying in the wilderness become the warning and the witness of the time about to be fulfilled. The time, indeed, was come to waken up; for Judgement was nearer to them now than when they first believed (cp. Rom. xiii. 11).

Ruskin, in an interesting passage bearing on a period which compares in some respects with the one before us, says that "the greatest men of any age, those who become its leaders when there is a great march to be begun, are indeed separated from the average intellects of their day by a distance which is immeasurable in any ordinary terms of wonder. But we far overrate their influence (though we cannot overrate their power); because the apparently sudden result of their labour or invention is only the manifested fruit of the toil and thought of many who preceded them, and of whose names we have never heard. The skill of Cimabue cannot be extolled too highly; but no Madonna by his hand could ever have rejoiced the soul of Italy unless for a thousand years before many a nameless Greek and nameless Goth had adorned the traditions, and lived in the love, of the Virgin." (*Mornings in Florence.*)

Similarly, may we not say that the vast popular movement which John awoke was due not merely to his own prophetic voice and vision, but to the thought and toil of prophets and of seers and others in the past who had seen that only by cleaving to the paths of the individual moral life, the paths of righteousness, could the people ever be prepared for admission to the kingdom? When the Judgement came, as come it shortly and surely would, each man's work of what sort it is would be proved, and character, and character alone, would fit him to stand up to his lot among

the people of God. In speaking to the masses as he did, John was really speaking for them, he was only putting into strong prophetic terms that which all had learned in some degree to think or feel. " For John came unto you with the way of righteousness " (Matt. xxi. 32).

But while John connected his baptism, chiefly, with the coming kingdom, he connected it also with the " Coming One," and this feature must be added to the other if we are to grasp its epoch-making significance. The three evangelists, varying again in some points, agree in the substance of the statement that " there cometh after me he that is mightier than I . . . He shall baptize you with the (or a) holy Spirit " (*πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, the divine breath) (Mark i. 7–8 ; Matt. iii. 11 ; Luke iii. 16 ; cp. John i. 27, 33). Mark, it is said, omits the announcement of the coming One as Judge, just as he omits that of the Judgement to come—even *καὶ πυρί* are absent in i. 8. Luke is alone, in this connexion, in preserving a striking indication of the extensive power of the Baptist's preaching : " And when the people were expecting, and all were reasoning in their hearts about John whether haply he himself might be the Christ, John made answer, saying to all, I for-my-part with water baptize you . . . (*ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς*), but there cometh he that is mightier than I " (iii. 15). It may well be that the thought which stirred so much debate induced the Baptist to expand his message as he did even if it did not produce the expansion itself. Abbott suggests that to acquire such notoriety his baptism must have been going on for some time. " It would seem, then, a legitimate inference that the Baptist did not begin to utter his testimony to Jesus till he had experienced some sense of failure." But his testimony to Jesus, or rather to the Coming One, was due, as one may think, not so much to a sense of failure

as to the deeper sense of what became him in face of the stupendous issues of the time. For while it is true that in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic the Coming One is "no organic factor" of the coming kingdom, and the figure is often absent from the picture of the future, still it is as often present, mainly in fashion as the king but sometimes also as the priest and as the prophet, and occasionally as the priest and king combined. Thus in a book which holds a signal place in the Gospel history—the book of Zechariah—and which may have influenced John (cf. Zech. xiii. 1) as it influenced Jesus, there are foreshadowings in both its sections of a union in the person of Messiah of the offices of prince and priest, of sovereign and servant, and also of the Day of Jehovah.[1]

But whether it was there the Baptist found a forecast of the figure he announced, or in the apocalyptic scheme that hovered in his own surroundings, wherein the figure had a place of its own, he proceeded to affirm, according to the evangelists, that he was himself but the herald or precursor of a mightier One of whom he was not worthy even to be the slave. Here there is the note of a profound humility which does not issue primarily, as I think, from the personal sense of failure, but from the sense of the greatness of "the dispensation of the fulness of the times." Even although the advent of the Mightier would of itself convince a man like John of the insufficiency of his baptism as compared with the baptism of the holy Spirit and of fire, yet it did not convince him of its insignificance. It did not rule it out. It did not render it "null" or "nought." His baptism had its purpose even as he had his place and his

[1] Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, pp. 435, 461, 472. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*.

prerogative as herald of Another. That Other would continue and complete what he had been divinely sent to begin. He would usher in the kingdom whose nearness he had been appointed to proclaim. He would baptize in a more subtile and sufficient element than the water which he had perforce to use. And He would execute the Judgement which he had admonished the people to escape, cleansing His threshing floor with winnowing-fan, gathering the wheat into His garner, and burning the chaff with unquenchable fire. Thus the Coming One, whose form was always somewhat indistinct and changeful to the general gaze, became, as it were, the very body of the Baptist's word and witness. He was no less real than the kingdom that would come along with Him. And as John thought of the kingdom mainly in terms of Judgement, or of "the coming Wrath," so he thought of the Mightier as divinely apparelled and empowered to act as Judge. One might say, therefore, that John conceived of the Mightier in accordance with the principle or point of view for which he himself stood. He would be ἰσχυρότερος, indeed, but along the lines which he had marked and made his own. When he pourtrayed Him as he did it was upon the pattern which had been shown him in the wilderness, and had drawn him forth himself to preach and proffer baptism. He would not only proffer a preparatory baptism with water, but confer the ideal baptism with the holy Spirit and with fire (Isa. xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 27). And He would do this effectually in His capacity as Judge, judgement being no less His task to accomplish than it was the herald's to announce. In all this John is referring not to the historic Christ as such but simply to the Expected One. From the few fragments of his preaching in the first three gospels it is not possible to obtain a more distinct conception of the Aftercomer than

that of the predestined agent or executor of judgement.

Too much, perhaps, has been made by some in this connexion of whether the person John foretold was Messiah Himself, or merely some "forerunner" or "witness" of the same. Even if the Messianic idea was many-sided and indefinite, as it could scarcely fail to be, still there is the significant fact, which Luke records, of the intense excitement of the people and their eager questionings, which were all directed to the one central point, "Can he be the Christ?" (Luke iii. 15). Our records at least would have us understand that John, in answering and saying unto them all—as Luke puts it—was thinking of *ὁ Χριστός*, when he spoke of One so much more mighty and majestic than himself, and of His baptism with the holy Spirit and with fire. Hence if we retain the phrase "with the (or a) holy Spirit" in Mark i. 8 (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16), we must take it not in the later Christian sense, but in a sense compatible with the Baptist's point of view. To explain it in the Christian sense would seem to make the ignorance of John's disciples in Ephesus wellnigh incredible (Acts xix. 2); and it would make the phrase itself incredible. But is there any reason why we should not interpret *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* in the light of the earlier world of thought to which John belonged and from which he was never able to emerge? Thus Abrahams says: "There is no ground for the emphatic statement that 'the only conception of Baptism at variance with Jewish ideas is displayed in the declaration of John that the one who would come after him would not baptize with water but with the Holy Ghost,'" (*Jewish Ency.*, ii. 499). The idea must have seemed quite natural to Jewish ears, as is evident from such parallels as Joel ii. 28, Zechariah xii. 10, Ezekiel xxxvi. 25–31, xxxix. 29. And as for the phrase *καὶ πυρί*, which is absent from Mark, the same writer

says that "fire is the natural element for purging, and is frequently used in the Old Testament in the two senses of punishing and refining." "Fiery baptism is a purging process and in Luke (iii. 17) is associated with the winnowing-fan ('but the chaff he will burn'). The context is equally clear in Matthew (iii. 12). This is a frequent Old Testament usage."[1] And, finally, as Abbott points out in a valuable note, the mention of the winnowing-fan suggests that the Baptist may have borrowed the word from the only passage (Isa. xxx. 24) where it is found in the Old Testament, where Isaiah goes on to describe the purification of the nations by God, whose "tongue is as a devouring fire, and his breath or spirit is as an overflowing stream." And he adds that "it is quite in accordance with Mark's free method of paraphrase that he should express this technical and metaphorical word by its recognised equivalent in the Christian Church, viz., 'the Spirit.' This would be all the more natural as the Hebrew winnowing-fan is derived from 'breath' or spirit, and the two words are somewhat similar."[2]

Now if we may adopt these various attempts to unearth the true significance of words and phrases which have long been hid, we need not assent to the view that the evangelist Mark simply "assimilated" John's baptism to the Christian rite, or that he and the other evangelists have drawn John into the Christian circle, and described his work as a whole in Christian terms. For when we read the phrases in the light of their Old Testament connexions we can see that they are appropriate enough to a man like John, who while heralding the future was still beholden to the past, and who believed primarily in an avenging rather than

[1] *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, I. Abrahams, pp. 43–45.
[2] *The Corrections of Mark*, 340a. Cf. Clue.

in a gracious God of Israel. From which belief springs the vast difference of atmosphere or of spirit between John and Jesus. The next thing is to trace more closely the connexion between John and Jesus, and the contrast and cleavage, also, the lines of which have been partially laid down.

JAMES ROBERTSON CAMERON.

## *THE KNOWLEDGE CLAIMED IN LUKE'S PREFACE.*

In an earlier article in the Expositor [1] a suggestion was made concerning the purpose expressed in Luke's preface at variance with the usual interpretation. In this article objection is raised against another widespread and probably erroneous confidence about that significant sentence. It is commonly said, and that by critics of all schools, that Luke in his preface explicitly excludes himself from the category of eyewitnesses and asserts that instead he writes on the basis of diligent research. *Ex uno disce omnes.* Jülicher's statement may be cited as typical [2]: "He does not belong to the original eyewitnesses, does not even claim to have had close relations with them, or with any one of them, for he only wishes to write 'even as they delivered unto us' (that is, to us Christians of a later day): of himself he writes directly afterwards in the singular, *ἔδοξε κἀμοί*. . . . He bases his confidence on being able to produce something better . . . on his own exhaustive and methodical labours [Studium]." The basis for this interpretation is partly in the structure of the sentence and its implication, and partly in the meaning assigned to the participle *παρηκολουθηκότι* in verse 3.

### I.

The meaning of *παρηκολουθηκότι* is not a matter of logical inference but of lexical knowledge. Semantics

[1] Eighth Series, No. 126 (June, 1921), pp. 431 ff.

[2] *Einleitung*, § 27, 1 (English Translation, 1906, p. 330).

usually seems a dull science to theologians, but in this case perhaps an extended discussion of the verb is warranted by its importance.[3]

Unfortunately the verb is used in so many senses that absolute certainty is impossible. We may distinguish the following possibilities :

(*a*) To follow, literally. In this sense *πᾶσι* must be masculine and refer to the *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται*. The author then speaks of himself as a disciple or follower of the first Christians. This interpretation was a favourite in the early Church and suited the requirement that the gospels should be either by apostles or by those who followed them.[4] It seems to find little support in modern times and may perhaps be dismissed.[5]

(*b*) To follow with attention and understanding what is told or written ; hence, in a sense, to read. If this meaning be adopted, the antecedent of *πᾶσι* is probably not the masculine *πολλοί* nor the feminine *διηγήσεις*.[6] Rather it is neuter and its antecedent is the contents of earlier writings suggested by *πολλοί* and *διήγησιν*. The adjectives easy to follow (*εὐπαρακολούθητος*) and hard to follow (*δυσπαρακολούθητος*) are often applied to *διήγησις* in literary criticism. But this author does not connect his work with the reading of earlier writings, though at least

[3] I have already dealt briefly with this verb in Appendix C to *The Beginnings of Christianity* (edited by Jackson and Lake), Vol. II. (1922), to which I must refer the reader for the evidence on matters in the preface of Luke which here are taken for granted. To the list there given (p. 489 note) of articles and monographs dealing with the preface of Luke in general add Sir R. Ellys, *Fortuita Sacra* (1727), pp. 72–80 ; M. von Aberle, *Theol. Quartalschrift* (1863) ; A. Hilgenfeld, *Z.W.Th.* xliv. (1901), pp. 1 ff. (*cf. ibid.* xl., pp. 420 ff.) ; M. Dibelius, *Z.N.T.W.* xii. (1911), pp. 337–340 ; K. Weiss, *Theologische praktische Monatschrift*, xxiii. (1912), 1–12.

[4] Justin, *Dialog.* 103 ; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 2, etc.

[5] The adverb *ἀκριβῶς* does not suit this meaning.

[6] Even the latter is grammatically possible by the usage whereby a plural pronoun referring to a singular feminine antecedent may be neuter.

part of it was based upon them. This interpretation appears to have no advocates.

(*c*) To follow events through direct contemporary knowledge, especially as an eyewitness or participant. In this case *πᾶσιν* means the matters (? *πραγμάτων*, verse 1) which the author intends to write about.

Two other meanings which are here excluded may be mentioned for the sake of completeness:

(*d*) To follow a rule or principle, to obey, imitate or conform to a standard. This requires as object an abstract noun, e.g.: *διδασκαλία* (1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10), *προαίρεσις* (2 Macc. ix. 27, *v.l.*). It is common in Hellenistic philosophic writing.

(*e*) With an inanimate subject, to ensue, result, occur afterwards or at the same time, e.g.: [Mk.] xvi. 17, *v.l.*, *σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασι παρακολουθήσει ταῦτα.*[7]

Now it must be observed in the first place that there is no support for another meaning often attributed to the verb, viz.:

(*f*) To examine into, investigate, to apply research. Perhaps the second meaning (*b*) given above comes the closest to it, but it is very doubtful if that is meant here. For in the Hellenistic writers who use the word in discussing their works it invariably applies not to the writer but to the reader.[8] At most it would mean only the intelligent

[7] In illustration of this usage one may refer to the tract *De venenatis animalibus eorumque remediis* by Philumenius (edited by Wellmann, 1908), which in thirty-seven pages uses the verb nineteen times of the "results" of bites. Cf. with [Mk.] *l.c.* Dioscorides, *De venenis, praef.* (Kuhn, xxvi. 6), *τὰ παρακολουθοῦντα σημεῖα ἑκάστῳ τῶν φαρμάκων*. Is pseudo-Mark also (Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 90) among the doctors?

[8] See the passages cited under (1) in *Beginnings of Christianity*, II. 501 from Archimedes, Artemidorus, Theophrastus, pseudo-Demosthenes, Vettius Valens. So Strabo explains in the beginning of his work (i. 1, 14, Casaub., p. 8) that if he cannot go into detail in every matter he will at least try to go far enough for the reader he has in view (*ὁ πολιτικός*) to understand (*παρακολουθεῖν*). So Polybius speaks of his readers in i. 12, 7;

and attentive understanding of what is read or told, not deliberate inquiry. Appeal is usually made to Arrian's Epictetus for the meaning of research. This was done by Grimm in his classic article on Luke's preface [9] and has been repeated by others. But the verb in Epictetus does not mean philosophic reflection and research, but rather the understanding and obeying (i.e., following) of the divine will, the Stoic life according to nature.[10] Nor is there any other passage where the verb seems unmistakably to mean investigation.[11] In Josephus, *Contra Apion.* i. 10, it seems rather to be contrasted with inquiry: *ἢ παρηκολουθηκότα τοῖς γεγονόσιν ἢ παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων πυνθανόμενον.*[12]

Another passage to which appeal is wont to be made is the well-known passage in Demosthenes, *De Corona*, chap. liii., § 172 (p. 285), *παρηκολουθηκότα τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ συλλελογισμένον ὀρθῶς τίνος ἕνεκα ταῦτ' ἔπραττεν ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ τί βουλόμενος*, cf. just below *ὁ γὰρ μὴ ταῦτ'*

iii. 32, 2. Similarly it is used by Josephus (*Contra Apion.* i. 23) and Justin (*Dial.* 114, 1) of those who read (*ἐντυγχάνω*) the Jewish scriptures without understanding them, and by Galen of those who cannot understand the older medical writings without an interpreter, etc., e.g. Kuhn, xv. 728, xvii. A. 698, xviii. B. 190. So Dionysius of Halicarnassus about the readers of Thucydides (*Epist. ad Pomp.* iii. 13 = *De Thucyd.* ix. 6). Similarly with reference to what is said orally (*τοῖς λεγομένοις*) Aeschines, *Adv. Timarch.* 116, *De falsa legatione* 44; Anaximenes, *Ars rhetorica*, 29 (ed. Spengel, p. 54); Iamblichus, *De vita Pythag.* 20; Marcus Aurelius, vii. 4.

[9] *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xvi. (1871), pp. 33 ff.

[10] As objects of the verb appear *τῷ διοικοῦντι τὰ ὅλα* (ii. 16, 33), *τῇ διοικήσει τοῦ θεοῦ* (i. 9, 4), *τῷ βουλεύματι τῆς φύσεως* (i. 17, 15; iii. 20, 13), *τῇ φύσει* (i. 17, 18), *τῇ φυσικῇ κατασκευῇ* (ii. 10, 4).

[11] Zahn, *Introduction*, § 60, note 9, cites in addition to Epictetus the two passages in Polybius mentioned above, but these passages certainly deal with the reader's attention and understanding, not the author's research.

[12] If there were any doubt that this distinction is meant, the following words of Josephus would remove it; for he explains that he has in his writing supremely illustrated each method, since in the *Antiquities* he translated the sacred writings which as a priest he knew, while of the events recorded in the *War* he was *αὐτουργός* of many, *αὐτόπτης* of most, ignorant of none.

*εἰδὼς μήδ' ἐξητακὼς πόρρωθεν ἐπιμελῶς*. But this passage looks quite the other way, as is obvious to any schoolboy who studies the oration. Demosthenes is referring to what was required of an Athenian at that crisis when the news of the capture of Elatea came to Athens (339 B.C.), and he describes himself as one who fulfilled that requirement. He had been in touch with the international situation for some time, following from the first (i.e., more than a dozen years) the encroachments of Philip upon Greek sovereignty, and he had formed an accurate judgment about them with the help of this long perspective. He is making no claim of research or investigation. *ἐξετάζω* in the following sentence means evaluation not inquiry. He has carefully reflected on the significance of the events, but a knowledge of the events themselves had come to him throughout the preceding years by reason of his continued interest and occupation in the foreign policy of Athens. The text-books of Demosthenes refer to Luke and usually translate correctly,[13] e.g., "der die Ereignisse mit seiner Beobachtung begleitet hat" (Blass), "who had kept himself *au courant* with" (Holmes). It is just this meaning which Demosthenes uses again of himself, *De falsa legatione*, § 257 (p. 423), *ὁ τὰ τούτου* [Aeschines] *πονηρεύματ' ἀκριβέστατα εἰδὼς ἐγὼ καὶ παρηκολουθηκὼς ἅπαντα*, cf. *Adv. Olymp.*, § 40 (p. 1178), *τοῖς εἰδόσιν ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα ταῦτα τὰ πράγματα ὡς ἔχει καὶ παρηκολουθηκόσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς*.

More recently Moulton and Milligan[14] have claimed a parallel in the papyri. They quote P Par 46, 19 (153 B.C.) *νομίζω γὰρ μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων παρακολουθήσαντά σε τῇι ἀληθείαι πικρότερον προσενεχθήσεσθ' αὐτῶι*, calling it "an appeal of Apollonius to his brother Ptolemaeus to examine

[13] The commentaries on Luke refer quite as regularly to Demosthenes, but they translate incorrectly.

[14] EXPOSITOR, Seventh Series, No. 57 (Sept., 1910), p. 287.

personally into his grievance against a third party," and translating "when you have investigated the truth you will deal with him most severely." But like the instance from Demosthenes this illustration turns quite against the alleged meaning of "investigate." Apollonius is not appealing for investigation, but is asking Ptolemaeus to summon the offending party to trial. He has chosen to have his suit tried before Ptolemaeus rather than before any other judge (lines 14 ff.) and will summon [15] no other than Ptolemaeus as witness of the maltreatment he has suffered (lines 5–10), "for," he continues, "I think you will deal more (most ?) severely with him since you most of anybody else (*sic*) have been cognizant of the truth of the case." The idiomatic mixed comparative and superlative phrase (*μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων*) [16] shows that the verb refers not to future inquiry but to past first-hand knowledge, suitable for one who is to be sole witness and for the judge most likely to favour the complainant. It is possible that other papyri illustrate almost the same force of the verb as when a letter says, "I write in order that you may follow," i.e., keep in touch with events, e.g., PSI, 411, 3 ff.; P Lond. 23, 54 ff. (quoted in my previous discussion of the word); P Tebt 6, 10, *ὅπως παρακο . . . μηθέν . . .* C.I.G. 2557 A. 6, *ὅπως παρακολουθῶσιν Ἀλλαριῶται τὰ ἐψηφισμένα περὶ τούτων.* In the last case and elsewhere (e.g., P Oxy. 653) we may suspect that the verb has rather the sense (*d*) "obey." A fresh and full examination of the verb's use in papyri and inscriptions,[17] including the

[15] The reading of the verb originally read falsely by Letronne as *ἐπισπα-σ[άμεν]ον* is still uncertain (see S. Witkowski, *Epistulae Privatae Graecae*, Second Edition, 1911, p. 86), but the meaning is tolerably plain.

[16] See the same idiom in Strabo vii. 7, 4 (Casaub., p. 323) *Θεσσαλονικείας Μακεδονικῆς πόλεως ἡ νῦν μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων εὐανδρεῖ.*

[17] To the instances from the papyri given above and those in Moulton and Milligan, *Lexical Notes*, *l.c.*, add BGU 1123, 12; PSI 665. The instances of the verb in the Pastoral Epistles (see below, note [22]), in Ecclesiastes

use of the object in the accusative, is greatly to be desired and may be expected in Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.*

It is clear however that thus far no satisfactory evidence has been produced[18] for the conventional interpretation of the verb in Luke i. 3 as meaning "research" or "investigation." If we were not aware of the longevity of untested exegetical tradition we should be surprised that a meaning so little supported should be so emphatically and universally accepted.[19] Even Blass says, "Polybius and other Hellenistic authors employ the verb in the sense of studying, and there can be no doubt that Luke's use is the same."[20] McLachlan correctly summarizes Blass and modern translators when he says that by this participle "is meant 'gone over' (Moffatt) in the sense of 'investigation' (Weymouth), 'nachforschen' (Weiss), or 'study-

ii. 12 (Symmachus), in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, col. 54, line 19, are among other passages needing reconsideration.

[18] Schlousner, *Lexicon in N. T., s.v.*, suggests in addition to examples already mentioned some others, but none is satisfactory. His reference to Plato, *Phaedo* 38, is an error. Plato does use the verb elsewhere, but not in this sense. Porphyr., *De abstinentia*, I. 117, should be I. 7, and illustrates meaning (*b*) or (*d*). In Philo, *De opificio mundi*, 4 (Mangey, p. 4) the verb is used of the illustration of a city which we may "take as our guide" (Yonge) in describing how the world is made. In Marcus Aurelius, ii. 8, vi. 6, vii. 3, 24, various other uses occur. The scholia on Thucydides V. 26, 5 only confirm the meaning of contemporary knowledge, for this is precisely what Thucydides is most vigorously emphasising in the passage which the scholiast twice paraphrases by παρακολουθέω. He began to write when the war broke out (I. i. 1) and lived through it (ἐπεβίων) with an attentive interest and understanding.

[19] There is one early but isolated example of the interpretation παρακολουθέω = *investigo* in حسب of the Sinaitic Syriac version, *ad loc.* Other early versions usually keep the original ambiguity by a literal rendering "follow."

[20] *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 18. The evidence of Polybius consists probably of the passages invoked by Zahn (*Einleitung*, II. 393 ; cf. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, II. p. 267), which when quoted partially, without their context, might seem to apply to the research of the author rather than to the intelligent attention of the reader. Evidently they have been often examined superficially, or not at all.

ing' (Blass), a sense in which the word is used by Hellenistic writers."[21] For a century this semasiological impostor appears to have held practically absolute sway.[22] It is nearly as difficult to find any modern protest against it as to find any ancient evidence to support it.

In excluding, then, this usual interpretation of *παρηκολουθηκότι* we seem to be forced to adopt the third meaning (*c*) given above and to understand that the writer is claiming first-hand contemporary knowledge. The perfect tense does not imply, therefore, as Lagrange[23] believes, that the research has covered a considerable period of time, nor merely, as Zahn says, that the research was already completed when the author decided to write. It implies that at that time the author found himself possessed of informa-

[21] *St. Luke, the Man and his Work*, 1920, p. 77. J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, II. i. (1919), 20, goes further and seems to find in the verb, or at least in the clause, the thought of revision as well as investigation, rendering *παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν* "had revised them afresh with personal inquiry." Cf. Moulton and Milligan, EXPOSITOR, *loc. cit.*, "having investigated all the facts afresh."

[22] The last influential sponsor of any rival interpretation was Hug, who in his *Einleitung in die Schriften des N.T.*, Vol. II. § 33 (first published in 1808) defended the same thesis as the present article.

Hug also applies this meaning to the passages in the Pastoral Epistles, where the verb occurs (1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10). Certainly the misconstruction of Luke i. 3 and the indifference of critics to the verb's meaning of contemporaneous knowledge has affected the exegesis of these passages also. They are usually understood as meaning that Timothy has imitated or obeyed Paul's teaching, etc. (so above under (*e*)). But the spirit of these letters is not to commend the addressees but to exhort them to follow the standards they already know (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 2; iii. 14). Besides, in the second passage Timothy is said to have "followed" not only Paul's teaching, conduct, etc., but also the "persecutions, sufferings; what things befell me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured." The verb is of course ambiguous like our English "observe," and perhaps in this passage its meaning shifts from the observance of standards to the observation of conduct or events. If so, the latest English commentator (Parry, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1920, p. 63) is on the right track. But a good case could be made out for rendering the verb throughout without zeugma "were an eye-witness."

[23] *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 1921, *ad loc.*, cf. Zahn, *Kommentar zum N.T.*, III. [1] and [2], 1913; [3] and [4], 1920.

tion which had come to him through continuous contact (hence the metaphor of following) with the events. The perfect participle is almost invariably used wherever the verb has this meaning.[24] It has the true perfect sense of information as a result of earlier continuous association.

In the same way *ἄνωθεν* must be understood, not of the early point in the history to which the author carried back his researches, but rather of that early time in his own life at which his touch with events began and from which it has continued. Even those who assigned to the verb the meaning of "research" have been coming to prefer for *ἄνωθεν* a similar meaning—"having been engaged *since long ago* in the investigation of all things."[25] When it refers to the starting point of first-hand knowledge no other meaning is possible, and the passage is parallel to the other occurrence of the adverb in this writer: Acts xxvi. 4 f., *τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου ἐκ νεότητος τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις ἴσασι πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι, προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, κτλ.* It must be observed that in neither of these similar passages is *ἄνωθεν* necessarily an equivalent of *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. The Vulgate in Luke translates them by nearly synonymous terms: *ab initio* and *a principio*, but all that *ἄνωθεν* implies in these passages is that the author's knowledge of events narrated or the Jews' knowledge of Paul's life as a Pharisee began well back in the stream of time.[26]

[24] See the passages quoted or cited in *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 501 f. The exceptions seem to be those passages where the idea is negatived (Lucian, *Symposium* 1; Josephus, *Vita* 65), where the aorist participle is more natural.

[25] M. Dibelius, *Z.N.T.W.* xii. 1911), p. 337, and independently Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1919, in *Handbuch zum N.T. ad loc.* "längst."

[26] *ἀκριβῶς* presents no difficulty, although Zahn repeatedly insists that it suits no meaning but "ein Nachgehen und Verfolgen mit dem forschenden und begreifenden Verstand sowie mit der geschichtlichen Forschung und Darstellung." It applies easily to verbs of knowledge, even if that knowledge is contemporary and firsthand, and is often so used in the

## II.

So much seems certain. But can we go still farther and determine what kind of contemporary information *παρηκολυθηκότι* implies. In the papyri the verb is used once or twice in letters, expressing the purpose that the recipients may thus "keep in touch" with developments, but elsewhere, when the verb is used of a writer's or a speaker's information, it implies that wholly or in part it is derived from his presence or participation. In Philo, *De decalogo* 18, it is applied to a witness in court who has seen and heard; in Polybius i. 67, 12 it is parallel to *τοὺς εἰδότας στρατηγοὺς τὰς γεγενημένας χρείας . . . καὶ πεποιημένους σφισὶ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*; in Lucian, *Symposium* 1, it suggests one who was present at a quarrel in person from the start in contrast to one who came in late in the middle of the quarrel. This is probably the meaning also in Demosthenes, *De corona l.c.*, and in other passages in his orations. It is natural, therefore, to infer from this word that the author of Luke and Acts is claiming first-hand knowledge, such as Demosthenes claimed concerning the recent machinations of Philip in Greece, and as Josephus claimed concerning the events of the Jewish war.

Is it really unlikely that we have such a claim? Certainly nothing is more characteristic of ancient writers than claims of *αὐτοψία* and no place more appropriate than in a preface.[27] The deliberate exclusion of himself from

passages cited. It is true that the adverb is suitable for verbs of inquiry like *ἐξετάζω* (Matt. ii. 8) and *πυνθάνομαι* (Acts xxiii. 20); but it is also used in the New Testament with verbs of knowledge like *οἶδα* (Acts xxiv. 22; 1 Thess. v. 1). In the papyri also it is found with all these verbs (examples cited in Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, p. 19).

[27] *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 499 *note*. An interesting parallel to Luke is presented by Herodian I. 2, 5 (cited by Zahn in *Neue Kirkliche Zeitschrift* xxxviii. (1917) 381 *note* as "wahrscheinlich ein Landsmann des Lukas)" who says that others have written of events before the death of Marcus, but he writes of events after that date which he himself throughout his whole life has seen and heard, and in part of which he shared by personal experience in the services (*ὑπηρεσίαις*) of his king and people.

this category, which is commonly found in the first part of Luke's preface, would be a rare piece of self-denial. And this strict interpretation of those earlier clauses is the chief obstacle to understanding *παρηκολυθηκότι* of actual presence or participation. It is interesting to watch the commentators "kick against the pricks." I quote the three most recent ones:

"Impossible is the interpretation which makes Luke an active witness of all the events which he is about to set forth, although this is linguistically possible. . . . This would make Luke an eyewitness from the beginning, which he emphatically declares not to have been the case."—Zahn.

"This verb has naturally a literal meaning, to follow the events as a witness. . . . But this sense is excluded by what Luke has said in verse 2. One must have recourse therefore to a metaphorical meaning: follow in thought, and here, make an inquiry."—Lagrange.

The author was "a man who had followed (perfect!) everything from the beginning and exactly—naturally in the spirit, *cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 6, since otherwise he himself would be *αὐτόπτης*."—Klostermann.

Evidently we have to choose either a strict construction of the earlier clauses of the preface, which would exclude Luke from the eyewitnesses, or the natural sense of *παρηκολουθηκότι*, which would include him. The former alternative has been the usual choice, but the latter may seem, after review of the evidence, really preferable. Let us turn therefore to that phase of the question.

## III.

In the first part of the sentence, "Many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word," four groups of persons are mentioned:

(A) The many (*πολλοί*) previous writers.

(B) We (*ἡμῖν*) among whom the things recorded were fulfilled.

(C) Those who were from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers (*αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται*) of the word.

(D) We (*ἡμῖν*) to whom they (C) delivered the information.

The question is, how are these groups related to each other, and how explicitly does the author associate himself or dissociate himself with these various groups, when he refers to himself alone a moment later in the phrase *κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι* ?

The obvious and usual inferences are that :

A and C cannot overlap, as they are expressed subjects of related clauses.

C and D cannot overlap, as they are subject and object (indirect) of the same verb (*παρέδοσαν*).

In a word, neither the author (since D includes him) nor the preceding writers (A) belong to the category of eyewitnesses and ministers of the word (C).

Strictly the sentence leads to these conclusions, but there are some reasons for suspecting this strict and somewhat mathematical method of interpretation.

(1) The use of *ἡμῖν* seems to include the author in both B and C, but these groups are not the same. When *πεπληροφορημένων* is translated "surely believed" they can be understood as the same. The "we" to whom the eyewitnesses handed down the story were the "we" who believed it. No doubt the consistency thus permitted was one reason why *πεπληροφορημένων* was so often understood as "surely believed" in spite of the linguistic improbabilities of that rendering. Now that it seems almost certain that *πεπληροφορημένων* means "fulfilled," "come to pass," a strict understanding of the passage will have to distinguish

between B and D. To be sure, the author includes himself in both B and D, but in B his associates are the Christians of all time "among" whom it may be said the events to be related have taken place, while in D he refers explicitly to his own generation to whom the information has been handed down. Only so can the thesis be maintained that the author was not among the eyewitnesses.

But the difficulty of this explanation is obvious. It is true that the pronoun "we" may be used by a writer to include with himself now one group, now another [28]; but the change in a single sentence is difficult unless the context makes it perfectly clear. Besides, it is quite doubtful whether the continuous self-consciousness of early Christianity was such as to warrant the explanation of B as meaning the Christians of all periods, including the earliest.[29] A single isolated pronoun would not be self-explanatory, and the explanation is particularly awkward as it means that in B the persons specially included with the author in the ἡμῖν are the contemporaries of the events narrated, while in D these are the very persons excluded from the ἡμῖν.

(2) Perhaps even more doubtful is the strictness of interpretation that excludes from the category of eyewitnesses all earlier writers mentioned. It is natural to take the expressed subjects of two clauses as quite different, and yet, if καθώς is not stressed as a subordinate rather than a co-ordinate conjunction, it would be possible to think of some overlapping: eyewitnesses and ministers have transmitted the story, and many persons have put it into writing. The author does not say, "Many have written

[28] So in the "we" passages this same writer includes different companions and sometimes even excludes Paul, Acts xx. 13–14; xxi. 12–14.

[29] This would be easier if Theophilus were not a Christian. The καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν used by Justin, *Dialog.* 81, in referring to the Apocalypse of John is to be explained as in definite contrast with non-Christians, or perhaps in contrast with the earlier prophetic gifts among the Jews (cf. 82).

as the eyewitnesses and ministers have transmitted *to them.*"

(3) The two objections presented are supplemented by a third if we admit that the preface is intended for Acts as well as Luke. Too often the close connexion between these books has been overlooked and the preface limited to Luke alone. But the whole ancient custom of prefaces suggests that the preface to the Gospel was intended for both books. The beginning of Acts confirms rather than contradicts that suggestion. What the evangelist in his preface says about himself and earlier writers must be made to square with Acts as well as with Luke. In the "we" passages we have precisely the work of an *αὐτόπτης καὶ ὑπηρέτης*. The literary problem presented by the abrupt appearance of these passages is difficult. Two theories most naturally present themselves, of which neither is entirely satisfactory. Either an earlier writing by an eyewitness is incorporated by the editor of Acts, or that editor himself was an eyewitness of the events which he narrates in the first person. But in both cases the strict interpretation of the preface falls to the ground, since there both the editor and his writing predecessors seemed to be excluded from being eyewitnesses. Thus while it is easy enough to say of the Third Gospel that neither it nor its predecessors were written by an *αὐτόπτης* or *ὑπηρέτης τοῦ λόγου*,[30] this cannot be said of Acts, and the usual interpretation of the preface is inapplicable.

The whole structure of the preface is perhaps more artificial than real. The author is not making exclusive contrasts but inclusive comparisons. In *κἀμοί* he associates

[30] For those who accept the tradition, going back to Papias, that the second Gospel was written by John Mark not even this is possible, for the author of our second Gospel is certainly one of the *πολλοί* and John Mark is explicitly called (by the writer himself in Acts xiii. 5) a *ὑπηρέτης* engaged in preaching the word.

his work rather than dissociates it from the earlier writings. *γράψαι* is not intended to contrast with *διήγησιν ἀνατάξασθαι*, nor the singular *ἐμοί* with the plural *ἡμῖν*. It is vain to emphasise *ἐπεχείρησαν* as an odious comparison implying that others failed where he hopes to succeed. Even though *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* and *ἄνωθεν* are not synonymous it would be vain to find here a deliberate contrast between participation from the beginning and his own information of more recent scope. Rather both he and his predecessors have accurate knowledge; in both cases that knowledge is the knowledge of eyewitnesses; in both cases it dates back to an early stage in the narrative.[31] That the pronouns are loosely used and that in so artificially antithetical a sentence the thought is not so carefully balanced as the syntax need awaken no surprise. It is possible that the author thus claims in the *κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι* a likeness both to the earlier writers and to the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, without the careful distinction that we are led by the sentence-structure to expect. Thus, while the claim of contemporary acquaintance may be attributed to the participle as a certainty, the claim of actual presence at the events is at least a possibility.

It is perhaps even harder to see why this well-supported meaning of *παρακολουθέω* has been neglected, than to understand why so ill-supported a meaning has been adopted in its place. The early Church, one would think, would have preferred a meaning which makes Luke a contemporary or eyewitness. But they were more interested apparently to prove that Luke was a follower of the eyewitnesses than to prove his direct knowledge of the facts, and therefore adopted the improbable interpretation (*a*)

[31] It is interesting that in Acts xxvi. 4 f., another rhetorical passage where *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* and *ἄνωθεν* occur, though their clauses syntactically are distinct, the content of their thought is practically identical.

that he claims to have followed all the apostles. The separation of Luke and Acts also affected their judgment, since in Acts the "we" passages would suggest that he was contemporary quite as much as that he was a follower of Paul. But this literal understanding of the "we" passages had another effect; if the use of "we" showed that Luke was present, the absence of "we" showed as certainly that he was not present. The Gospel contains no "we" passages. It must therefore be written, the Fathers thought, by hearsay rather than from *αὐτοψία*,[32] and, since the preface of Luke was now limited in its application to the Gospel, the verb *παρακολουθέω* cannot mean *αὐτοψία*. Of course it was still possible to claim from *παρακολουθέω* that Luke was a contemporary though not an eyewitness.[33] Perhaps that was excluded by other considerations.

The modern critics inherit some of these reasons for rejecting the suggestion that knowledge of an eyewitness or even of a contemporary is meant. Though the main theory of literal following of apostles has been demolished, some of the *débris* remains. The preface is still applied only to Luke and not to Acts, *ἄνωθεν* is taken to refer back to the birth of John and Jesus, and the new meaning of "investigate" or "study" is only too congenial to modern minds.[34] The first part of the sentence has seemed not

[32] Cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii., p. 497, n. 3.

[33] Is it possible that the appreciation by the Fathers of the fact that if the verb meant knowledge it meant *αὐτοψία* forced them to abandon this whole category of meanings because it did not square with their theories of the "we" passages?

[34] Such is the reverence for learning that the apologists for Luke's accuracy seem to have overlooked the possibility of his first-hand knowledge in their desire to establish his scientific method of research. The earlier age had other prejudices. The defenders of the orthodox canon were at more pains to prove that its authors were with apostles or knew apostles than that they knew the facts. Marcion, as far as we can tell, was indifferent to both these ambitions, while Papias preferred the oral traditions of his own epigonous age to the written gospels of the first century. *De gustibus non disputandum*!

only to exclude Luke from the eyewitnesses but to place him in an entirely subsequent generation. For this impression two words, *γενόμενοι* and *παρέδοσαν*, have been chiefly responsible. According to Harnack, the words of verse 2, "lassen die Generation der Augenzeugen als eine vergangene erscheinen."[35] Plummer says, "If these things were handed down to Luke, then he was not contemporary with them."[36] But *γενόμενος* does not mean that the witnesses were dead, nor is *παράδοσις* used only of the transmission of knowledge from age to age.

## IV

Whether it implies an eyewitness or merely a contemporary, such a claim of intimate personal knowledge in the preface of Luke has an important bearing on the questions of date and authorship. Fifty out of the fifty-two chapters in the work go back no earlier than the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. With much if not all the period from this date to the end of Acts, that is, about three decades, the author claims contemporary information. Many scholars will find here a fresh confirmation of the early date of composition recently urged by Professors A. von Harnack and C. C. Torrey.

To many who have cherished the belief that the two books to Theophilus were written by Paul's doctor friend and associate, the suggestion will come as a welcome surprise that the preface not only may, but perhaps must, be understood to claim contemporary and first-hand knowledge. Instead of confining the preface to the Gospel and assigning to *παρακολουθέω* a meaning which apparently it was not

[35] *Chronologie der altchristliche Litteratur*, 1897, p. 248 *note*. But Harnack in his progress towards an earlier dating of Luke-Acts has abandoned this interpretation. See *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii., p. 500 and *note* 2, and especially Excursus V. in Harnack's *Acts of the Apostles*.

[36] *Int. Crit. Com.*, p. 3.

intended to bear, they will now apply the preface to the whole work and will find in it a very clear statement of their own view of the "we" passages, namely that the author himself from "early on" (*ἄνωθεν*) in the story [37] had been an actual eyewitness of what he describes. It is because of this close association with a considerable part of the story that he can commend to Theophilus his attempt to give authoritatively the facts concerning which the latter has been rather vaguely apprised. As the whole apologetic purpose expressed by Luke in verse 4 may be conjectured to apply especially to the closing chapters of his two-volume work, with their *apologia* for Christianity,[38] so *παρηκολουθηκότι* in verse 3 perhaps was specially chosen in the light of the first-hand knowledge also embodied in the last part of Acts. It is no great exaggeration to say that the diarist has for some time (*ἄνωθεν*) been an eyewitness of everything (*πᾶσιν*). The preface then unmistakably identifies the diarist with the author himself. Those who believe that the author thus at the outset of his work claims for himself an imtimate part in the events

[37] On *ἄνωθεν* compare above p. 409 and *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 502 f. The word deserves further study in the light of the probable meaning and reference of *παρηκολουθηκότι*. The commentaries usually translate like the Vulgate "from the beginning" and suggest that it refers to the material which Luke in his nativity stories was enabled by his researches to prefix to Mark. But the word represents not time measured from the beginning but considered with reference to the present, starting from a point remote from the present and extending down to the present. It means "of long standing," "from of old" (good examples in Wettstein, *ad loc.*, and Moulton and Milligan, *s.v.*), and if it is thought that its use in Luke's preface must be understood to suggest comparison with such a work as Mark, it is far less likely to refer to what comes before Mark's outline than to what comes after, i.e., in Acts.

[38] See EXPOSITOR, June, 1921, p. 439. One of the merits of the discussion of Ed. Meyer in his *Ursprung und Anfänge Christentums*, i. 2, is his insistence upon the unity of Luke and Acts and upon the special importance of the latter: "Ja man wird sagen dürfen, dass der eigentliche Anreiz zu seinem Werk eben in diesem zweiten Teil gelegen hat und er den ersten eigentlich nur als die dafür unentbehrliche Voraussetzung aufgenommen hat."

narrated may justly maintain that the appearances and disappearances of the "we" in Acts become less abrupt and unintelligible with this explanation than under any other hypothesis.

To others, who like the present writer have never been much convinced of Lucan authorship either by the ancient tradition or by the newer linguistic arguments based in part on identity of style between the "we" passages and the rest of the work and in part on a discovery of medical terminology in its vocabulary, this new consideration may seem the most convincing. Of course, its force may be weakened in various ways. Perhaps personal presence is more than the verb *παρηκολουθηκότι* actually claims. Possibly it was just the kind of verb that included both presence and indirect though contemporary information, and could be used by one who wished to suggest the utmost knowledge without defining too specifically how intimate that knowledge was. The preface was peculiarly liable to exaggeration in antiquity, and claims of *αὐτοψία* were not always sincere.[39] Even if no more than a continuous contemporary acquaintance with the events of Paul's missionary career is claimed, we may insist on taking even that with a grain of salt. We shall prefer to form our judgment of the author's knowledge from the contents of his work rather than from any boastful claims of his own.

Both parties, however, whether arguing for or against early date and Lucan authorship, will do well to eschew the conventional habits of settled exegetical conformity. Whether we believe him or not, the possibility must be left open that the author is claiming in the very beginning of his work to have been long in such close contact with the series of events which he unfolds as to be possessed of first-hand contemporary knowledge about them, and

[39] *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 499.

that perhaps he means to claim the knowledge of an actual eyewitness. At any rate he says nothing of research.

HENRY J. CADBURY.

## *THE LETTER OF ZOILOS.**

AMONG the papyri discovered in Philadelphia (Faijûm) presenting the correspondence of Zenon (third century B.C.), one is of outstanding importance. This one is a letter from a devotee of Sarapis, Zoilos by name, to Apollonios, the minister of finance under Ptolemy II. Philadelphos, in the year 258–257 B.C.[1] It seems to me to have unusual significance for the history of religion, especially for the letters and religion of Paul.

I present herewith the text with a translation and explanation, and finally, I seek to sketch its significance.

*Greek Text.*

'Απολλωνίωι χαίρειν Ζωίλος 'Ασπέν[δ]ιος τ[ῶν .....]
ὃς καὶ διασυνεστάθη[2] σοι ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως φίλων·[3] ἐμοὶ συμβέβηκεν
θεραπεύοντι[4] τὸν θεὸν Σάραπιν περὶ τῆς σῆς ὑγιείας καὶ εὐ[η]μερίας τῆς
πρὸς τὸμ βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Σάραπίμ μοί χρημα[τίζει]ν πλε[ον]άκ[ι]ς
ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις, ὅπως ἂν διαπλεύσω πρὸς σὲ καὶ ἐμ[φανίσω σοι τοῦτ]ο[ν] τὸ[ν]
χρηματισμόν,[5] ὅτι δεῖ συμτελεσθῆναι αὐτ[ῶι ὑπὸ σοῦ Σαραπιεῖόν τε][6]
καὶ τέμενος ἐν τῆι Ἑλληνικῆι πρὸς τῶι λιμέν[ι] κα[ὶ] ἱ[ερέα]ἐπιστατεῖν κ[αὶ]

---

* Translated by Arthur S. Emig.

[1] Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini [= PSI], Vol. IV, Firenze, 1917, Nr. 435. Also cf. the important new reading of C. C. Edgar, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, t. 18, Nr. 7, p. 173 ff., and the discussion of Ulrich Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrus-Forschung* 6, p. 394 ff. The letter is now in the Cairo Museum. I am indebted to Wilcken for his kind information about the text.

[2] In place of *διασυνεστάθην*.

[3] With this court title cf. *Bible Studies*, p. 167 ff.

[4] Wilcken thinks of incubation. With the expression cf. LXX. Judith xi. 17.

[5] From *responsum divinum* like Rom. xi. 4 and often elsewhere.

[6] A clarifying addition of Wilcken.

ἐπιβωμίζειν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν·[1] ἐμοῦ δὲ π[α]ρ[ακαλέσαντος τὸν θεὸν Σάραπιν,][2]
ὅπως ἄμ με παραλύσηι τοῦ ἐνταῦθα [ἔργο]υ, εἰς ἀ̣ρ̣ρ̣ω̣σ̣[τ]ί̣α̣[ν] μ[ε πε]ρ̣ι̣έ̣β̣α̣λ̣εν
μεγάλην ὥστε καὶ κινδυνεῦσαί [με]. προσευξάμενος δ[ὲ] αὐ[τῶι, ἐ]ά̣[μ με]
ὑγιάσηι, διότι ὑπομενῶ τὴν λ̣ηιτο[υργ]ίαν καὶ ποιή[σει]ν τὰ ὑφ' αὐτοῦ
προστασσόμενον. ἐπεὶ δὲ τάχιστα ὑγιάσθην, παρεγένετό τις ἐκ Κνίδου,
ὃς ἐνεχείρησεν οἰκοδομεῖν Σαραπιεῖον ἐν τῶι τόπωι τούτωι καὶ προσ-
αγηγόχει λίθους· ὕστερον δὲ ἀπεῖπεν αὐτῶι ὁ θεὸς μὴ οἰκοδομεῖν κἀκεῖνος
ἀπηλλάγη. ἐμοῦ δὲ παραγενομένου εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ ὀκνοῦντός σοι
περὶ τούτων ἐντυχεῖν,[3] ἀλλὰ περὶ πραγματείας ἧς καὶ ὡμολογήκεις μοι,
πάλιν ὑπετροπάσθην μῆνας τέσσαρας· διὸ οὐκ ἠδυνάμην εὐθέως παραγε-
νέσθαι πρὸς σέ. καλῶς οὖν ἔχει, Ἀπολλώνιε, ἐπακολουθῆσαί σε τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ
θεοῦ προστάγμασιν ὅπως ἂν εὐίλατός[4] σοι ὑπάρχων ὁ Σάραπις πολλῶι σε
μείζω παρὰ τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ ἐνδοξότερον μετὰ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ὑγιείας
σὺ οὖν
ποιήσηι. μὴ καταπλαγῆις [[.]] τὸ ἀνήλωμα ὡς ἀπὸ μεγάλης σοι δαπάνης
ἐσομένης[5], ἀλλ' ἔσται σοι ἀπὸ πάνυ λυσιτελοῦντος· συνεπιστατήσω[6] γὰρ ἐγὼ πᾶσι
τούτοις.

εὐτύχει.

*On the reverse side:*

*Note of receipt (in another hand):*

Ζωίλου περὶ Σαράπιος.
Λκη, Αὐδναίου θ,
ἐν τῶι Βερενίκης
ὅρμωι.

*Address:*

Ἀπολλωνίωι.

*Translation.*

To Apollonios greetings from Zoilos the Aspen(d)ian one of the
( . . . )
who is presented to you by the friends of the king. It occurred
as I was worshipping before Sarapis interceding for your health
and success
with King Ptolemy, that the Sarapis several times
ordered me while sleeping that I should go to you and (give you
this)

[1] The sacrifices for Apollonios have validity for him as the founder, the κτίστης. (Wilcken.)

[2] This (or a similar one) addition seems necessary to me, as the subject of the following sentences can only be Sarapis, and thus he must be mentioned beforehand. παρακαλεῖν is the technical expression (2 Cor. xii. 8).

[3] Cf. *Bible Studies*, p. 121 f.

[4] Cf. *Bible Studies*, pp. 122, 258.

[5] Instead of ἐσόμενον (Wilcken).

[6] Cf. 1 [3] Ezra vii. 2. The governor of Coele-Syria and Phœnicia and others carried out the order of Darius to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem: ἐπεστάτουν τῶν ἱερῶν ἔργων.

advice: it is necessary (that you) erect (for him [1] a Sarapis temple)
and a temenos in the Greek quarter near the harbour, and a priest must be placed in charge (and)
sacrifice for you upon the altar. After I had (petitioned the god Sarapis)
that he might relieve me from this (task [2]) he afflicted me with a terrible
sickness so that my life was endangered. But I (promised) in prayer to him that if he
would cure me, I would gladly be obedient to him, and (do) what was commanded by him. After I had rapidly recovered a man came from Knidos
who tried to build a temple to Sarapis and had brought
the stones for it. Later the god forbade him to build and the man
went away. But when I came to Alexandria and hesitated to present the matter to you—only in the matter in which you had already given me assurance (did I deal with you)
a relapse came lasting four months, wherefore I could not at once come to you. It would be well, Apollonios, if you
would obey the god's order, so that Sarapis may be well pleased with you
and that you may become greater and more popular with the king and not to forget the health of your body.
Do not be alarmed at the expense, for it will cost you much. But therefore it shall be all the more valuable for yourself. I myself will help to officiate with everything.[3]

Farewell.

*On the reverse side:*

*Note of receipt (in another hand):*
From Zoilos, concerning Sarapis.
In year 28 on 9 Audnaios
In Berenices
Port.[4]

*Address:*
To Apollonios.

All the principal parts of the text can be understood. We must, however, seek to place ourselves back in the years

[1] Or *here.*

[2] Namely the task financed by Apollonios, but of course built by Zoilos.

[3] Zoilos does not consider the building of the temple as profane work, but as a holy liturgy, as a spiritual task.

[4] The location of this place is not certain. Edgar, *Annales*, 18, p. 174, thought on the shore of the Red Sea, but in *Annales* 19, p. 81, has withdrawn this supposition.

258–257 B.C. at about the time when the first pages of the Septuagint were brought forth in Egypt.

Zoilos, a citizen of the Pamphylian town Aspendos, is passing through Alexandria. He has grown up in close contact with the cult of Sarapis of which special revelation has been made to him. Exactly where he lived during his lifetime cannot as yet be determined [1]; but surely it must have been a harbour city in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, which was not purely Greek and which was then possibly under the sway of Ptolemy II. Philadelphos.

In this city Zoilos had a religious experience which finally drove him to Egypt. In the service of Sarapis he had interceded for a distant patron: the Ptolemaic Minister of Finance, Apollonios, with whom he had come in contact since he had been introduced to the powerful state official by members of the Egyptian court-party. It is quite possible that the Sarapis cult afforded the bridge. This god answered the prayer for this rich man in a unique way; he ordered his devotee personally to give Apollonios the impression that he must build a Sarapis temple at the home of Zoilos (where probably up to that time only an obscure altar of Sarapis had stood, possibly in a rented hall [2]), with temenos and its own priest of sacrifice at the harbour in the Greek quarter.

A great affair! Even though the demand of the god complies with the desire of his life, the mystic finds it a

[1] Michael Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.* Madison, 1922, p. 38 (cf. p. 192) believes this Zoilos to be identical with the agent of Apollonios in Syria by the same name (PSI, Nr. 330); so also Vitelli, p. 161, considers it.

[2] Thus Wilcken, *Archiv* 6, p. 395, who in considering the case of Delos in 200 B.C. (*Inscriptiones Graecae*, XI, 4, Nr. 1299) points out where Sarapis also appears in a dream and demands the erection of a temple in place of the rented hall. (Cf. Otto Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis-Religion*, Tübingen, 1919, p. 19 ff. and 31 ff. It is worthy of note that also in Delos the god simply says δεῖ: it *must* be built!).

burden upon his soul and he begs for a dispensation. But Sarapis makes clear to him the seriousness of his demand by permitting his opponent to become deathly sick. Zoilos vows in his prayers to give unconditional obedience, and the matter becomes more serious: a follower of Sarapis from Knidos had used the time in which the resident cult associate was ill to gather stones for the building of a temple to Sarapis for his own interest. But he was forbidden to build, and compelled to leave the city by a decree of Sarapis. The god does not desire a temple merely, he desires a temple from Apollonios. Apollonios can bring more to pass than the anonymous resident of Knidos.

Thus Zoilos embarks for Egypt. But when he arrives in Alexandria it is impossible for him to gain an audience with this busy and popular man concerning the matter of the temple, though this man is also burdened with other religious matters.[1] He only confers with Apollonios about another matter on which there was no reason for concern. Hereupon the enraged god permits the hesitating one to feel his heavy hand again. The malady returns and confines Zoilos to his bed for four months. When the first signs of the returning disease appeared Zoilos would gladly have rushed to Apollonios, but he was too ill. Then, too, in the meantime the minister had departed on business, and can now only be reached by letter.

As a result Zoilos writes to Apollonios from Alexandria and relates the whole story with its serious significance: the epiphany of the god and his resentment, also the danger that an unknown resident of Knidos might secure the treasure for himself. But as yet nothing is lost. While

[1] Spiritual matters which reach the State Ministers are likewise also mostly financial matters. Thus in the same year the Aphrodite priests turn to Apollonios, PSI IV, Nr. 328 (cf. Wilcken, *Archiv* 6, p. 386), moreover, with the similar *do ut des* holiness, which I characterise below.

the time is serious still the powerful god can be satisfied, and Sarapis will greet his obedient slave with much mercy, daily sacrifice will be offered for Apollonios in the temple which he himself is to build. The influence of Apollonios in the court will spread, the name Apollonios will gain renown for holiness over land and sea, and above all, the god who so severely punishes the obstinate with illness, will reward holy obedience with health and long life.[1] In contrast to this the expense is not to be considered! This capital brings large returns! Moreover personal bother Apollonios would not have with the construction of the temple. All material matters would be attended to by Zoilos as Apollonios' co-worker. For Zoilos considers it his holy duty to do this.

The letter reached the one to whom it was addressed. Its entrance into the waiting-room of Zenon, an officer of Apollonios, was noticed under the title "concerning Sarapis."[2]

Edgar, and especially Wilcken, have already pointed out the significance of the Zoilos letter for the history of the Sarapis cult. One can truly see into his propaganda, into his entanglement with the Egyptian court and its officers.

This is entirely correct and points likewise to the significance which the text has for the understanding of the nature of Paul's letters. The Zoilos letter is one of the first exact parallels of the letters of Paul in the Greek language: it is an accidentally preserved piece of real propaganda correspondence of an ancient cult. Not propaganda literature, but a reflex of propaganda, in truth an act of propaganda itself, a part of the actual events.

Every ancient missionary cult naturally brought forth such correspondence in large quantities. But this gigantic

[1] The experienced propagandist knows how to handle the wealthy man.
[2] This formulation is interesting: one would really expect *Sarapieion*.

mass of writings which at one time were sent back and forth between Egypt and the remainder of the territory about the Mediterranean or between Italy and Syria, and in which the visions, the plans, the itineraries of the missionaries, the successes, the failures of their efforts, a lively mirroring of the finances of the propaganda are found, is for nearly all cults as good as lost. Only the Christian cult with its gathering and canonising of the letters of Paul has preserved a part of its oldest missionary documents. In this Zoilos letter we have a lost letter of the Sarapis cult which also enables us to understand more correctly the unliterary uniqueness of the apostolic letters.

It must not be overlooked that it is also indirectly a great help to understand the contents of Paul's letters. Contact and decisive contrast can be observed. Both men consider their propaganda as their holy duty.[1] Paul, like Zoilos,[2] stands under the direct working authority of his lord and is led in the serious moments of his life by wisdom from above, their command[3] and (as the man from Knidos[4]) through prohibition[5] and he also knows, like the follower of Sarapis,[6] the inescapable godly *must*[7] of such a command. Both dare in prayer to ask for escape from godly burdens, but find out that the higher will is the stronger.[8] Like Zoilos[9] so Paul is urged[10] in a dream to take an ocean trip, and knows as he[11] does the compelling power of a promise.[12] Like the follower of Sarapis[13] so the slave of Jesus Christ is visited with a terrible sickness[14]

[1] *Zoilos Letter*, 11.; 2 Cor. 9. 12; Rom. 15. 16.
[2] *Zoilos Letter*, 4. [3] Gal. 2. 1; Acts 22. 18, etc.
[4] *Zoilos Letter*, 14. [5] Acts 16. 6–7.
[6] *Letter of Zoilos*, 6. δεῖ.
[7] δεῖ Acts 19. 21; ἀνάγκη 1 Cor. 9. 16.
[8] *Letter of Zoilos*, 8. ff.; 2 Cor. 12. 8 ff.
[9] *Letter of Zoilos*, 9. and 15. [10] Acts 16. 9 ff.
[11] *Letter of Zoilos*, 10. f. [12] Acts 18. 18, cf. 21. 23 ff.
[13] *Letter of Zoilos*, 10. and 17. [14] 2 Cor. 12. 7 ff.

and Paul recognises, like Zoilos,[1] the suffering as God-willed.[2] Both practised intercession for their cult comrades,[3] and both had to deal seriously with spiritual competitors.[4] Finally in a formal way the mutual unliterary character of both is shown, for instance, in the anacoluthons which mirror the spoken language in their letters.

Sharper, of course, are the contrasts. The power and uniqueness of the apostolic Christian cult is clearly brought out against the background which this Sarapis cult document affords.

First of all the contrast of the sociological structure is gigantic. The representative of the Sarapis cult "presented" to the minister of finance has an immediate contact with one of the strongest and richest politicians of his day, and through him closely mediated relations with the court of Ptolemy. The entire letter has its chief argument unexpressed therein that the King is thought of as the one who is the protector of the Sarapis cult, and that therefore the founding of a Sarapis temple is the best means of rising in the pleasure of the King.[5] Proportionately a prominent follower of Sarapis does not bother about little matters; his god entrusts him with commissions which cost,—indeed cost so much that even the wealthy Apollonios requires good words to induce him to accept. But even if the minister should refuse, gold and stones for the temple would have been there nevertheless.

The tent-maker of Tarsus was not "introduced" to anyone. At best he was brought to the state officials as

[1] *Letter of Zoilos*, 9. f. and 17. [2] 2 Cor. 12. 7 ff.

[3] *Letter of Zoilos*, 3 f.; Phil. 1. 3.

[4] Like the words of Zoilos about the man from Knidos we find a similar consciousness in the words of Paul (Rom. 15. 20); he has placed his honour in not "building upon another man's foundation," ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ. The Knidian obviously desired to build upon the ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον of Zoilos.

[5] Cf. Wilcken, *Archiv* 6, p. 395.

the accused; friendly meetings as with the Governor of Cyprus [1] were accidental. His "relations" were almost exclusively with the property-less classes.[2] And even his relations in Alexandria, even an Apollonios [3] were *mighty* only in the scriptures.[4] Court-relations Paul never had; the greetings which he at one time sent *from the house of Cæsar* [5] did not come from princesses and ministers, but from simple slaves of Cæsar, little writers who were possibly working in Ephesus for financial or land interests. Bids for the favour of the court party as the inspired and unillusioned Zoilos sent, are entirely unknown to the Apostle. If Paul had financial problems to solve, there were no requests for marble masonry, columns, and statues to consider, for the building mania had not as yet taken hold of the young cult. But building played a great rôle in the imagination of the Apostle, whose Master during his earthly appearance had been a builder,[6] and the Apostle also speaks of temples. But with Paul one always thinks of temples "*not made by hands*" [7] and not paid for in gold, but the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit,[8] the church as the temple of the living God.[9] And when Paul compares himself with an "architect" [10] the age of the big Architect-Popes is still far off. But we are grateful to the Apostle for the deep and rich conception of the inner and spiritual edification.[11] Paul, like Zoilos, wrote of financial cares, but he does not present them to a millionaire, but to manual workers who lived in the business and harbour districts of the cities, urging them to save their mites from week to week for their poor comrades in Jerusalem.[12]

Decisive for the historical religious significance of both

[1] Acts 13. 6 ff. [2] 1 Cor. 1. 26 ff.
[3] Acts 18. 24; in Codex D Apollos is called Apollonios.
[4] Acts 18. 24. [5] Phil. 4. 22. [6] τέκτων Mark 6. 3.
[7] 2 Cor. 5. 1. [8] 1 Cor. 6. 19.
[9] 1 Cor. 3. 9, 16 ff.; 2 Cor. 6. 16; Eph. 2. 20 ff.
[10] 1 Cor. 3. 10. [11] 1 Cor. 14. 3, 5, 12, 26. [12] 1 Cor. 16. 1 ff.

cults is the deep difference in their ethics. The Sarapis cult as represented by Zoilos the Aspendian is in its practical dealings a hedonistic religion. Even though sociologically he had acquainted himself with the highest culture of his age, and the art and architecture of the Hellenistic age was at his command, in religion we find here something entirely primitive, really a business *do ut des* between man and fetish. Build a temple and your influence with the king will increase; if not, a severe fever will seize you! All great religions, even vulgar Christianity, have, in countless instances, closely united their empirical expressions with hedonism, like the holiness of Zoilos. Religion of Works! But three hundred years after the letter of Zoilos, different letters from a new cult are sent over the same sea, letters of which the centre of power is Mercy. Though preached to the lowly, the self-renewing energy of the revelation of mercy grasps the great, an Augustine, a Luther. And it will remain the vital core of the Reformations; for again and again everywhere, even in genuine stock, the savage comes to the surface, and the primitive religion of work appears with its original force. The great reformation of Paul, his struggle against justification by works and his zeal for mercy, in practice went not only against the Jews, but also against the cults of the nations. Primitive Christianity was a religion without a tabernacle, but because of mercy the apostolic Christ cult had a pre-eminence over the spectacular beauty of the neighbour cults. These cults seemed separated from the raw primitive religious customs, because of their fine formal culture. To the one, however, who has opened their tabernacles, the wild primitive chaos has been found again. One unique element of primitive Christianity is this, that it brings religion in its highest completion and inwardness near to primitive people, but in unpretentious forms of expression.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

## *JESUS' PREACHING IN CAPERNAUM.*

*Peter Speaks.*

Sabbath came; we went to Church together.
Half Capernaum followed: rumour had it,
Jesus was to speak. Till now our Master
Taught beside the sea or on the uplands.
Might the glamour fade here in the city?—
Cultured folk might be sophisticated.
Foolish fear of mine! That morning Jesus
Spoke as one inspired, nor did He tremble
When He saw those listening, frozen faces,
Slowly seething into consternation.
Quiet and serene He sat before them,
Speaking in the power of the Spirit
Which of old on Sinai spake to Moses.
While He talked, the ancient Law towered splendid,
Past all cavil; cold scribe-mongered precepts
Stared and stuttered ghastly in our faces,
Like an evil dream that fain would fright us
Forth from seeking for the Face behind it.

When He ended, fear and amazement
Turned the congregation into marble.
Maddened by the hush, an epileptic
Rushed before Him, screamed, and fell down trembling,
Voicing through his sobs the common terror:
"Leave us alone, thou Jesus of Nazaret, leave us,
Leave us, begone! Why art Thou come hither to grieve us?
I know Thee! I know Thee! Ever tormenting, destroying;
The Holy One, Thou. . . ."
Then Jesus laid His hands
On the lad's head, and smoothed the strands
Of tangled hair. "Peace, peace!" He said;
And straight the evil spirits fled.

Like a thunder-cloud the Scribes departed,
While the people tarried in the porches,
Whispering, "What is this? What mighty teaching!
Underived authority, not jargon!
Even the spirits are obedient to Him!
Strange! . . . He says, 'I came,' and 'I am sent here.'"

Is it any marvel, all that evening,
Ere the sun was set, they followed Jesus,

Pressed upon Him, brought their broken bodies,
Craving just to touch Him; since they heard Him,
Wonder-stricken; singing festive ditties
While they surged at sun-down round our door-step?—
Still He stayed within, but still they clamoured,
Shrieking out their woes across the shoulders
Rammed between them and the silent doorway,
Calling on Him to come out and settle
All their petty quarrels, all their problems,
Summoning Him to come and be their leader
In a great revolt against the Empire. . . .

Ah, within the dim-lit room sat Jesus,
Silent as a Grecian god of marble,—
Nay, *their* brows have never shown such anguish,
*Their* eyes never held such burning pity.—
Long, long after the last cries had faded
Down the street, and left the city silent,
Jesus sat there, nursing unknown sorrow;
Wondering sore, we went to bed at midnight.

Half-way through between midnight and morning,
Like a soft shadow some one passed my pallet
(We were sleeping on the roof for coolness);
It was Jesus. I leaned on the cope-stone,
Half-awake, and watched Him hasten darkly
Down the steps, and gain the street, and vanish.

*On the Hills behind Capernaum.*

I thought to find Thee as I lay
Forspent upon my bed;
But grief took all my prayers away
Or ever they were said.

Sleepless, and searching still, I rose
And up the city street
I sped. "Who knows?" I cried: "Who knows?
Here God and I may meet."

But here my God and I have met
Upon the dark hillside;
And though He has not spoken yet,
Beneath His wings I hide.

Father, I come to Thee again
Before the break of day;
Thy child is half-afraid, and fain
Would kneel by Thee and pray.

For when I use Thy friendly might
To still the demon's cries,
And use Thy pity to bring sight
Again to blinded eyes,

And when I heal their passing pain,
They haunt me night and day;
But—when I offer heavenly gain,
They lightly turn away.

They turn away with careless eyes:
Father, why should this be?
Say, must my pearl of Paradise
Be spilt in mire for Thee? . . .

Thy stars are silent; faint and few
Through yon deep haze they shine;
No heavenly foot-fall prints the dew,
No hand is laid on mine.

O God, untouched, unseen, unheard,
Thine Eastern deserts glow;
Light my heart's night with one clear word,
And I will rise and go.

Next day, ere the sun rose, came the people
Surging back once more about the doorway,
Crying out for Jesus. When I told them
Jesus was gone forth, they would hear nothing
But that we should hunt Him out and tell Him
Every one was wanting Him. We found Him
Praying in a lonely grove of olives:

"Nay, my friends, I will not come
Just now into Capernaum.
But come with me, while I declare
The Good News of the Realm elsewhere.
My Father called me to this hill
Before the dawn, to learn His will.
Long seemed He silent, then I heard
His answer to my questioning word;
He brought me forth that I might know.—
It is His pleasure we should go."

On we went from town to town. The people
Heard Him gladly. Many asked Him questions:
"Tell us what it is that hides God from us?"
"Why are our eyes veiled while your eyes see Him?"

"How are we not sure if we possess Him?"
"What does *selling all you have* amount to? . . ."
All these questions found their shining answer
Clustered in one Sabbath talk, my memory
Treasures as they say pearls treasure sunlight.

"How shall God be manifest,
And shine within a human breast?—
When anxious Fear and lean-eyed Care
No longer make their dwelling there,—
Care, the corroding rust, and Fear,
The moth, that blights your earthly gear,
Hungry destroying thieves that spoil
The hard-won gains of daily toil;—
When your heart has no delight
Save to keep its casements bright;
When your eyes have no desire
Save to burn with heavenly fire,
Then through Vision's open door
The boundless light of God will pour.
O, without that holy light,
How dreadful and how dark the night!
And that most dreadful darkness binds
Bands around divided minds.
Choose this world, your way is dark;
Halt between earth and heaven, the spark
Of light soon fades from out the clod:
Ye cannot serve the world and God.—
To serve the world? And still to be
More careful for the things you see,
Your meat, your drink, the clothes you wear,
Than for the spirit harboured there?—
Is not a human soul more worth
In God's eyes than its house of earth?
Behold the birds of heaven, how they
Nor sow, nor reap, nor store away,
Yet God feeds them! And will not He
Who cares for birds of small degree
Care much more for you and me?
Which of you by mental strife
Can add a minute to his life?
God who measures out your days
Will surely care for you always.
See the lilies of the field!
They neither spade nor distaff wield,
And yet I tell you Solomon,

With all his kingly splendour on,
Was not arrayed like one of these.
If then your heavenly Father please
So to clothe the meadow flower
That blooms and passes in an hour,
How much more will He take care
That living souls go neat and fair.
There's one good coat upon your back;
Possessing this, what do you lack?
Children, how little you rely
On God's love when you sigh and sigh,
'Who will refill my empty barrel?
Who will renew my worn apparel?'
Nay, in this untrustful strain
Only pagan folk complain,
Bear no more than this day's sorrow,
Nor add what may not come to-morrow.
Rather spill your cup of gladness
On To-morrow than your sadness.
He knows your need of joy or pain;
Seek first your heavenly Father's Reign.

Lo, all things draw you: wheeling birds,
And the wild wandering flocks and herds,
The denizens of dust and sea,
Are symbols of Eternity;
They seek their home and find it, they
Whisper of Home at close of day."

While He spoke we seemed to see the Kingdom;
Through His eyes our eyes beheld the Father.
But we went a day's march in the mountains,
Sullen, fretted by the hot sirocco
Driving clouds of sand across our faces.
Some lagged shouting on the rest to tarry,
Some hung heavy on the arms of comrades,
All of us were short and out of temper;
Strident words came crackling like the drought-fires.
Jesus heard and looked at us in sorrow;
Shamed and troubled, we made haste to ask Him,
"Master, thou hast shown us God's forgiveness;
Heaven lies about us when thou speakest.
Tell us why it fades while we are faring;
Why for us again the dusty highway?"
Then, like myrrh and balm to cleanse and comfort,
Came His words on man's and God's forgiveness.

"Even God forgives in vain
And even heaven is shut amain,
If you bear not with your brother,
And show kind hearts to one another;
For what can mercy mean to one
Who hath himself ungracious shown?
Do you mercy here withhold?—
You turn your heaven bare and cold.
But here on earth give mercy free,
And here on earth your heaven will be.
If your friend has wronged you, go,
Take him by himself and show
Where the fault lies; does he then
See it, you are friends again.
But if you still cannot agree,
Bring together two or three,
And my Spirit will be there,
And my Father hear your prayer.
Where two or three meet in my Name,
I am in the midst of them."

"Lord," I cried, "how often shall my brother
Sin against me and I still forgive him?
Rabbis tell us, *Three times:* say'st Thou, *Seven*?"
Like a whirlwind came the amazing answer,
"Not seven times, but SEVENTY TIMES SEVEN!

And do not proudly, even then,
Measure yourself by other men;
I tell you, the forgiving spirit
Is a duty not a merit.
For though you do the things I say,
Forgiving fifty times a day,
God's slaves for best and worst are ye,
No duty sets from Duty free.
The weary yokels still prepare
At close of day their master's fare;
And God demands from all who live
That endlessly they shall forgive.
Contrast these small debts owing you
With all this vast debt standing due
To God in His account book.—Due?
Yes, but He has crossed it through!—
And could you now so much as look
Into your little ledger book,

Or ask your fellow-man to pay,
Since God wiped all that debt away?"

Then there came a leper to Him, kneeling,
"Lord," he pleaded, "if You are but willing,
You have power to cleanse my dire uncleanness."
Silly soul, to think the Master's mercy
Was some magic trick apart from willing!
You or I would not dare touch a leper.
Selfish flesh is dainty, so we, cunning,
Call our squeamish nausea holy shrinking,
Prank our fear in robes of sacred ritual.
Where's our ritual now? The Master *touched* him!

O that you had seen Him lay His two hands
Tenderly upon that leper's shoulders,
Hold him there a moment, softly murmuring
Little, piteous phrases whose slow music
Died into a hush of loving anguish!
So they stood together, one in suffering,
Close embraced, the dreadful leper hidden
Deep in the red folds of Jesus' garment.
There's a ritual for you! There's forgiveness!
*Himself took our sicknesses and Himself*
*Suffered our infirmities.* That's Jesus!

Flashed then surely on His mind foreboding.—
Ah, the worm that gnawed this rose of pity!
Ah, the thorn that marred this rod of healing!
He, the ruth of heaven—"wonder-worker";
He, God's healthful anguish—"necromancer!"
Separate they stood now, Jesus frowning
While He chafed against those bitter visions;
Then He spoke: "Don't tell, don't tell a creature!
Softly to the Temple; give your offering;
Home then softly."
Poor soul, he went shouting
To the very stones all day till sunset,
"Jesus healed me!" After that we dare not
Enter town or village; yet the people
Poured out to the desert places, crying,
"Come and heal us!" So that tour was ended.
Fugitive, we stole back to Capernaum.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.
JAMES ALEX. ROBERTSON.

## *JEWISH APOCALYPTIC IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.*

### III.

THE theological conceptions which emerge in Jewish Apocalyptic, and which may be regarded as specially characteristic, will become intelligible when the considerations that have been adduced in the previous article are borne in mind.

Reference has already been made to the transcendental view of God that pervades the apocalyptic literature. This is fundamental. It may truly be said to pervade all forms of late Judaism, but nowhere does it come to clearer expression than in apocalyptic. God is supreme over the world. He dwells at an inaccessible height, and is surrounded with an impassable barrier of fiery glory. One need only read such passages as Daniel vii. 9. ff.,[1] which describes 'the Ancient of Days' seated upon a throne in heaven—a throne of "fiery flames, and the wheels thereof burning fire"—and ministered to by myriads of attendant spirits, to realise this aspect of the conception. Such descriptions as 'the Most High,' 'the Exalted One' are common paraphrases for 'God' (cf. 4 Ezra vii. 33 f., 37 f., 132 and often, *Ap. Bar.* xviii. 1 ; xxiv. 2, etc. ; Dan. iv. 31 f., etc.), and we may compare with these the terms common in the Rabbinic literature, 'The Holy One, blessed be He,' 'The Omnipresent,' and similar expressions. God dwells in the highest (i.e. the seventh) of the heavens (*Test. Levi* iii [2]), and one of the characteristic names of the Divine Being is 'the God of heaven' (Dan. ii. 18 f., v. 23 ; cf. 2 Macc. iii. 39), and even 'Heaven' alone (Dan. iv. 23 ; 1 Macc. iii. 18 ; Luke xv. 18).[3]

[1] Cf. also 1 Enoch xvi., Rev. iv.

[2] *In the highest (heaven) of all dwelleth the Great Glory, in the holy of holies far above all holiness.*

[3] Note also that 'the Kingdom of Heaven'='the Kingdom (or rule) of God' in the Gospels.

One effect of this conception was to stimulate the development of a rich angelology and demonology. As Prof. Porter remarks: "One-sided stress on the transcendence of God above and apart from the world always involves the substitution for his presence in the world of some sort of intermediary agency."[1] This again is a characteristic of popular Judaism, as it had developed in the apostolic age, and can be traced not only in apocalyptic, but also in the Targums and other late Jewish literature. The way had been prepared by the quasi-personification of Wisdom (cf. Prov. viii.), and the tendency is illustrated in later literature in the way in which such agencies as the *Memra* ('Word'), the Holy Spirit, the Shekinah, and the figure of Metatron are spoken of.[2] In the Apocalyptic literature the rôle of Metatron is assumed by Enoch 'the heavenly Scribe,' while in the figure of the heavenly Son of Man of the similitudes of 1 Enoch (xxxvii.–lxx.) the idea of a supernatural being, second only to God Himself, who shares God's throne (lxii. 3, 5), possesses universal dominion (lxii. 6), and to whom all judgment is committed (xli. 9, lxix. 27), the conception attains its highest expression. To the whole idea of any intermediate agency between God and man later Rabbinical Judaism was intensely hostile, and the Rabbinical teachers strove as far as possible to eliminate it from the popular consciousness.

We must, however, be on our guard against supposing that the conception of God's transcendence necessarily banished God's active presence from His world in popular piety. Doubtless the danger was present, and can be detected in some of the Apocalyptic books. But in some of the finest it seems to have been overcome. It must be remembered that if God was to be conceived of as supreme over

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 58.

[2] See *Relig. and Worsh. of Synagogue*, chapter ix., for a full discussion.

His world a transcendental view of Him was an inevitable development.

With the breakdown of the old narrow boundaries of national life, and the rise of great world-Powers, the conception of Kingship, and therefore of the divine Kingship, was necessarily enlarged. The heavenly King and His court were perforce drawn on a scale that necessarily transcended that of any earthly potentate. But one of the most remarkable triumphs of the religious instinct is to be seen in the fact that these conceptions of the divine power were combined with a vivid realisation of God's presence and accessibility to the humble of heart, who trusted and appealed to the divine Father. Nowhere is the uniqueness and transcendence of God more splendidly and frequently asserted than in the discourses of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah; yet the prophet is able to combine this with the opposite truth in such a passage as Isaiah lvii. 15:

*For thus saith the High and Lofty One, that inhabiteth*
*Eternity, whose name is Holy:*
*I dwell in the high and holy place,*
*With him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit.*

And this passage has a parallel in one of the latest and finest of the Jewish Apocalypses, 4 Ezra viii. 20 ff.

*O Lord, that dwellest eternally,*
*whose are the highest heavens,*
*whose chambers are in the air;*
*Whose throne is beyond imagination,*
*whose glory inconceivable;*
*before whom (heaven's) hosts stand trembling,*
*and at thy word change to wind and fire;*
*whose word is sure,*
*and behest constant;*
*whose commandment is strong,*
*and enactment terrible;*
*whose look drieth up the depths,*
*whose indignation melteth the mountains;*
*whose faithfulness standeth Eternal—*

*Hear the voice of thy servant,*
*Give ear to thy creature's petition,*
*and attend to my words.*

No conception of God could be more transcendental; yet the seer does not hesitate to make his moving appeal directly to One who however exalted is yet accessible to the sinner's prayers. In the same context we meet with an assertion of God's uniqueness and unity, and of His fatherhood (in combination) as the one creator of all (viii. 7, cf. vi. 1–4). All this should make us pause before we lightly assume that the transcendent God of late Judaism (including the apocalyptic books) was so remote and inaccessible, so entirely removed from His world, as to be an impossible object of worship, or only to be worshipped as a cold and lifeless abstraction. The danger of 'a one-sided stress on the transcendence of God' was present, but the religious instinct was strong and vital enough to overcome it without sacrificing the truth underlying the transcendental idea.

In other directions the transcendental conception exercised marked influence. It sublimated the older Messianic hope. The golden age promised by the older prophets was lifted up from the plane of the present earth into the heavenly sphere. "The contrast between the present and the coming age became a contrast of two worlds." The beginnings of this dualism are already present in Daniel, where the sequence of the world's history is sharply divided into two periods—the one the period of the world-Empires, symbolised by the animal forms, which will be followed by the rule of the saints, symbolised by the figure of one "like unto a son of man," and coming in suddenly and abruptly after the evil powers have been judged. It culminates in the apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch. Here the dualism is emphatic and pronounced. The present age and the future, the Above and Below, are in fundamental opposition:

*The Most High hath made not one Age but two* (4 Ezra vii. 50).[1] Since Adam fell *the ways of this world became narrow and sorrowful and painful* (4 Ezra vii. 12, cf. iv. 27); it is a *corruptible world* (iv. 11) and *is hastening fast to its close* (iv. 26). Similar passages are to be met with in the Apocalypse of Baruch; thus one (xliv. 9) runs:

*For everything that is corruptible will pass away, and everything that dies will depart, and all the present time will be forgotten, nor will there be any remembrance of the present time which is defiled with evils* (cf. xxi. 19, xxxi. 5).

In contrast with the present corruptible world-order (or age), *the ways of the future world are broad and safe, and yield the fruit of immortality* (4 Ezra vii. 13). In the future Age, which is already prepared,

*The (evil) root is sealed up from you,*
*infirmity from your path extinguished;*
*And Death is hidden,*
*Hades fled away;*
*Corruption forgotten,*
*Sorrows passed away;*
*And in the end the treasures of immortality are made manifest* (4 Ezra viii. 53 f.).

In the same way the Apocalypse of Baruch speaks of *The new world which does not turn to corruption* (xliv. 12), which is *now invisible* and *hidden* (li. 8).[2]

It is true, then, to say that 'a transcendental, supernatural element' disinguishes the apocalyptic hope of the

[1] In the Slavonic Enoch the contrast between the present age and the future is marked (cf. lxi. 2; lxv. 8); when *all the creation of visible and invisible things comes to an end. . . . Then the times shall perish, and there shall be no year, nor month, nor day, etc.* (lxv. 6 f.); cf. the '*world to come*' (ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος) in the N.T. (Mark x. 30), and the language of St. Paul, who speaks of *This world* (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20; ii. 6, 8; iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4), or *this present evil world* (Gal. i. 4), or *this present time* (Rom. viii. 18; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Tit. ii. 12), or *this world* (1 Cor. iii. 19, v. 10, vii. 31), in implicit contrast to the 'world to come.'

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 8: *We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.*

future from the older Messianic ideas. Here again the beginnings of the dualistic conception are to be found in some parts of the prophetic writings which are older than Daniel, viz., Isaiah xi., Zech. xii.–xiv., Joel, Malachi iv., and Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., and, on the other hand, the naïve conception of the older national hope that the nation should be renewed and enjoy a period of felicity on a renovated earth, has survived in this literature (cf. 1 Enoch v., x., xxv., xc.). Yet the unearthly view is essentially and inevitably the characteristic development. In general the apocalypses look forward

> not to a simple restoration of David's Kingdom, or to a recovery of the ideal conditions of the patriarchal age, or even of the earthly paradise, but to a new earth fashioned after heavenly models and ruled by heavenly powers, a real descent of heaven to earth, and then gradually an ascent of the righteous to heaven and their transformation into angelic natures.[1]

Perhaps the most far-reaching difference in theological outlook between the older prophecy and apocalyptic lies in the belief, which became a dogma of orthodox Judaism, in the *resurrection of the dead*. It is a significant fact that this belief first emerges into clear expression in the apocalyptic literature. In the apocalyptic section Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., which almost certainly is older than the Book of Daniel, the belief is expressed that death will be abolished in the Messianic Age, and that the righteous dead will be raised to share in the coming glory of the nation :

> *He hath annihilated death for ever* (xxv. 8.)

While the wicked have no resurrection (xxvi. 14), the righteous shall rise :

> *Thy dead shall live : awake and shout for joy,*
> *ye that dwell in the dust !*
> *For a dew of lights is thy dew* (*O Jahveh*)
> *and Earth shall bring forth Shades* (xxvi. 19).

[1] F. C. Porter, *op. cit.* p. 52.

In Daniel the belief assumes a fixed and permanent place in the apocalyptic hope, and here both righteous and wicked are expected to share in the resurrection to receive the reward of their deeds (Dan. xii. 2, 3, 13). The author of Daniel seems to have in view especially the martyrs who have suffered death on account of their faith, and it is worth noting that the association of martyrdom with the resurrection persisted, and reappears in the New Testament *Apocalypse* (Rev. xx. 4 ff., cf. 2 Maccabees).

But though the belief became an integral part of the apocalyptic hope it seems occasionally to have been obscured, especially in the older literature. Thus in 1 Enoch v. 7–9 what seems to be contemplated is not a resurrection to life, but a life on earth unusually prolonged. Gradually, however, the belief established itself firmly and assumed fixed forms. Thus in the Similitudes it assumes a definite shape :

*In those days shall the earth also give back those who are treasured up within it, and Sheol also shall give back that which it hath received, and Hell shall give back that which it oweth . . . and the Elect One will in those days sit on my throne* (li. 1 ff., cf. xlv. 1–3, lxi. 5).

It is perhaps doubtful whether this passage implies a general resurrection of all mankind, or only of Israel. It is probable that the writer was 'thinking' only of Israel. On the other hand 4 Ezra vii. 32 certainly seems to refer to a general resurrection of all mankind (cf. verse 29, *all in whom there is human breath*). Another point on which uncertainty continued to prevail was the question whether the resurrection should be confined to the righteous only, or should embrace righteous and sinners alike. According to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 14) the former view was that of the Pharisees, as it certainly was of the author of 2 Maccabees (vi. 26, vii. 9, 14, 26, xii. 23 f., xiv. 46). It is also represented in the Gospels; cf. Luke xiv. 14 (*ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων*), and xx. 36, where the righteous are described as

"sons of the resurrection" (*τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοί*). Both theories are combined in the Johannine Apocalypse, where the martyrs are raised first, at the beginning of the millennium, to reign with Christ "a thousand years"; then at the final consummation, after the thousand years have ended, all the dead are raised to be judged (xx. 4 ff., 11 ff.). Another point on which there was division of opinion was whether the future life should be a purely spiritual immortality, or whether it should be clothed with a bodily organism. The latter view corresponds with the essential idea of a resurrection of the body. In the earliest apocalyptic writings the idea of resurrection is conceived in a crude and literal way, but with the growing sublimation of the national hope, and the gradual investiture of it with heavenly properties, the old crude ideas of resurrection had to be modified. The new body must be conformed to the heavenly environment of the life to come. In fact sometimes, as in the Salathiel portion of the Apocalypse of Ezra, the violent dualism which governs the conception of the present Age and the Age to come extends also to the material and the spiritual. The material is the 'corruptible.' The body, regarded as the prison-house of the soul, is described as *this corruptible vessel* (vii. 88). It is significant that in the Salathiel portion of the Apocalypse of Ezra apparently no resurrection of the body is contemplated; what seems to be anticipated is something approaching a pure immortality of the soul, but not quite the complete doctrine of immortality.[1] With the growth of the transcendental view of the next world, or age which was to

[1] Note that in the Salathiel part of 4 Ezra the conception of a final judgment is strongly emphasized, which is inconsistent with the doctrine of pure immortality, which involves judgment immediately after death; the same inconsistent phenomena are present in *Wisdom* and 2 Enoch (cf. also 1 Enoch xciii.–civ., and *Jubilees* xxiii. 31). The doctrine of a purely spiritual immortality is met with in Philo, the Essenes, etc.

succeed the present corruptible one, it was necessary that the development of the resurrection-idea should keep pace. "The new body must be one capable of the immortal, angel-like life of men in the heaven-like world to come."[1] Hence arose the conception of a 'spiritual body' (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44, 46), i.e. apparently a new bodily organism, but of so fine a texture as to justify the epithet 'spiritual.' Perhaps some such notion as this underlies the conception of the writer of the Salathiel portion of 4 Ezra, who speaks of the 'assembling' and 'quickening' of souls at the scene of the final Judgment (4 Ezra v. 43 ff.), i.e. probably of souls endowed with a 'spiritual' or soul-body.

It should be added that a long passage in the Apocalypse of Baruch describes the manner in which the resurrection should take place. Here the older ideas of a literal resurrection of the old body, and its spiritual transformation, are combined. According to this passage the dead will first of all be raised in their old bodily form, in such a way as to be recognisable:

*For the earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it now receives in order to preserve them, making no change in their form, but as it has received, so it will restore them* . . . (l. 2). Afterwards they will be transformed, the aspect of the wicked changing for the worse, while the glory of the righteous becomes even more splendid (li.).

Another direction in which transcendental ideas have worked with significant results in Jewish Apocalyptic is concerned with the idea of *the transcendental Messiah*. This is a very remarkable development, and one that is of great importance for the proper understanding of New Testament doctrine. It does not, however, seem to have penetrated popular Judaism in the way that the resurrection-belief did. Nor must it be supposed that the personal Messiah

[1] F. C. Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

occupies a predominant place in the apocalyptic literature. While what may be described as the Messianic Age, the future age of felicity however conceived, is an all-important and dominating feature, the figure of the Messiah himself occupies, on the whole, a secondary position. In 1 Enoch i.–xxxvi., xci.–civ., and in the *Assumption of Moses* there is no Messiah at all, while in 1 Enoch xc. he only appears after the establishment of the divine Kingdom by God Himself. In *Daniel* too, though the "one like unto a son of man" is, as we shall see, closely associated with the development of the transcendental Messiah, he hardly plays a messianic *rôle*, at any rate in the strictly personal sense. The overthrow of the tyrant Antiochus, and the establishment of the rule of the saints is effected by God Himself directly.

Nevertheless the Danielic "one like unto a son of man" has played a great *rôle* in the development of Messianic doctrine. The kinship between this mysterious figure and the heavenly "Son of Man" of the Similitudes of 1 Enoch is fairly clear, and probably also extends to the *Man* of 4 Ezra xiii. The author of Daniel used the term "one like unto a son of man" in contrast with the beasts who represent the world-empires, as a symbol for the people of Israel. But it does not follow that the figure 'like a man' (or 'son of man') has no individual or personal significance. On the contrary, it seems probable that the term is a descriptive one for an angelic being—presumably Michael in the thought of the writer of Daniel—who acts as Israel's representative and counterpart. The figure is thus both a symbol and a person. The author of Daniel may have been influenced, in using the term 'son of man,' by the figure of the cosmic Man, who in apocalyptic tradition was gradually invested with Messianic attributes. Originally in apocalyptic tradition this *Man* or *Son of Man* was conceived as a heavenly being

or angel, and was invested with attributes proper only to Jahveh Himself. Thus in the vision embodied in 4 Ezra xiii. 1–13a, the traditional features in which are much older than the interpretation (xiii. 25–53), this being, like Jahveh (Isa. xix. 1), rides upon the clouds (4 Ezra, xiii. 3, cf. Dan. vii. 13), and before him all tremble (cf. Ps. civ. 32), or melt like wax (Micah i. 4). The carving out of the mysterious mountain (4 Ezra xiii. 6) recalls the eschatological cleaving of the Mount of Olives referred to in Zech. xiv. 4—an act appropriate only to a theophany, as there described. The *fiery stream* and *flaming breath* by which the Man destroys the attacking host (4 Ezra xiii. 10 f.) has a parallel in the mythic description of the *Name of Jahveh* in Isaiah xxx. 27 f., while the violent storm and the war against an innumerable host of men are conventional features in theophanic descriptions of Jahveh's coming in the end of the days.[1]

The idea of the heavenly being who thus comes to view as a feature in old apocalyptic tradition is the source of the conception of the heavenly Messiah—the Son of Man—of the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch (1 Enoch xxxvii.–lxx.). We have already seen that the heavenly being "like unto a Son of Man" of Dan. vii. was probably identified by the author of Daniel with Israel's angel-prince Michael; this angelic being was later, it would seem, invested with Messianic attributes, and so became the pre-existent heavenly Messiah of the Book of Enoch, who is to judge both men and angels. His standing designation in the

[1] See the Ezra Apocalypse (ed. Box), p. 283, and cf. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der Israelitisch. judisch. Eschatologie*, p. 353 (pp. 349–358). The Man who has thus attained so fixed and secure a place in the apocalyptic tradition, represented by the literature cited above, is originally the Cosmic Man—the 'Urmensch'—who, endowed with supernatural gifts, fights and overcomes the monster of Chaos, and so liberates the Cosmos from the tyranny of Chaos (see besides Gressmann, as cited, Volz, *Eschatologie*, pp. 214 f., 216 f.).

Similitudes is "this (or that) Son of Man," seldom "the Son of Man." In other passages in the same section of the Book he is called "the Righteous One" (xxxviii. 2, liii. 6, etc.), "the Elect One" (xxxix. 6, xl. 5, etc.); "the Elect One of righteousness and of faith" (xxxix. 6), and God's 'Anointed' (i.e. Christ) (xlviii. 10, lii. 4).

Unlike the earthly Messiah of the national hope, who is born on earth of the seed of David, the angelic Son of Man of the Similitudes has his home in heaven "under the wings of the Lord of the Spirits" (xxxix. 7). He is pre-existent in heaven (xlvi. 1 ff.); his name was named "before the sun and the signs were created, and before the stars of the heaven were made" (xlvii. 3); he was "chosen and hidden" before the Lord of the Spirits, "before the creation of the world" (xlviii. 6). A real pre-existence of the Heavenly Messiah is here taught. It is noteworthy that emphasis is laid on the pre-existence of his *name*. The wonderful name of the Messiah is already dwelt upon in Isaiah ix. 6,[1] and in the LXX of Psalm lxxi. (=Heb. lxxii.) 17 the same doctrine is unmistakeably affirmed: *His (Messiah's) name endures before the sun* (*πρὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διαμενεῖ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*). The wonderful and mysterious character of the name is sometimes dwelt upon (cf. *Ascension of Isaiah* viii. 7, ix. 5), a feature which re-appears in the Johannine Apocalypse, where the Messiah bears a "name written which no man knoweth but he himself" (Rev. xix. 12). The significance of these passages will be missed unless it is remembered that according to ancient popular ideas name and person are practically identical. The hidden, mysterious, pre-existent character affirmed of the one applies equally to the other. It is true that in later Rabbinical theology the pre-existence of the Messiah's name (on the basis of Ps.

[1] Cf. also the LXX of this passage: *He shall call his name Angel of great counsel.*

lxxii. 17) is interpreted in an ideal sense, the notion of a real pre-existence of the Messiah's person being excluded.[1] But this is a mere refinement of earlier popular notions.

The Heavenly Son of Man of the Similitudes also shares with God Himself the Throne of Judgment at the last great Assize, and there and then will judge both men and angels (lxi. 8), slaying sinners by the word of his mouth, and bringing judgment especially upon "the Kings and the mighty" (lxii. 2 f., cf. lxiii. 11); the Day of Judgment is the "day of the Elect One" (lxi. 5); "And the Elect One will in those days sit on My throne," we read in li. 3, and will judge "Azazel and all his associates, and all his hosts in the name of the Lord of Spirits" (lv. 4); he will also exercise universal dominion, for "all creatures will fall down and bow the knee before him" (xlviii. 5). The Heavenly Son of Man thus appears as Ruler and Judge of the World. But it is a sublimated world. The plane of mere earthly existence is transcended. The writer of the Similitudes conceives the Messianic community as one day to be "composed of both angels and men under the rule of the Messiah and the immediate protection of the Lord of Spirits."[2] The transcendental idea could hardly be carried further. We have already seen that the nearest parallel to this conception in Jewish Literature exists in the vision of the Man from the Sea, embodied in 4 Ezra xiii. Traces of the same conception, however, have left their mark upon parts of the Apocalypse of Baruch, where it is said (xxix. 3) that after the Messianic woes are past, "the Messiah will begin to be revealed" (i.e. upon the renovated earth). Then follows a description of the felicities of the Messianic Age, and (ch. xxx. 1) it is then added:

*And it will come to pass after these things, when the time of*

[1] See Dalman, *Words*, p. 301 f.
[2] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 116.

*the advent (or παρουσία) of the Messiah is fulfilled, and He will return in glory, then all who have fallen asleep in hope of Him shall rise again.*

Here Messiah's "return in glory" can only mean, as Dr. Charles points out, his return in glory to heaven: "these words imply that the Messiah pre-existed in heaven before His advent. He returns whither He had come." The representation seems to be that the pre-existent heavenly Messiah is suddenly 'revealed' at the *parousia* upon earth, and at the end of his reign ascends to heaven. We may compare also, in this connexion, John iii. 13, where the heavenly Son of Man is distinctly alluded to:

*And no man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven.*

It is to be noticed that the heavenly Messiah, according to the original conception, is not 'born' upon the earth at all. When he appears upon earth he is suddenly 'revealed.' The Son of Man comes like a lightning-flash 'in his day' (Luke xvii. 24, cf. *Ap. Bar.* liii. 8–11). This is one of the fundamental differences between the representation of the heavenly Son of Man and the national Messiah. The latter is born of human parentage at Bethlehem, and though he might be concealed for a time and then suddenly 'revealed,' so that it could be said "when the Christ cometh no one knoweth whence he is" (John vii. 27), this representation in no wise impugns his human birth. But how difficult it was to conceive of a being who pre-existed in heaven as being born at all is shewn by such a passage as John vi. 41, where the Jews are represented as saying: *Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How doth he now say, I am come down out of heaven?* Yet in one passage at least in a Jewish apocalypse the two ideas are mixed. In 4 Ezra xii. 32 the Lion of the Eagle-Vision is explained to be *the Messiah whom the Most*

*High hath kept unto the end of the days* (i.e. the heavenly pre-existent Messiah), *who shall spring from the seed of David.* This identification may be due to an Editor who combined different sources into a single book; but even so the fact remains that he at least was able to fuse the two conceptions, which were also combined in the Christology of the New Testament writers. One of the most striking examples is to be found in the Christology of the Johannine Apocalypse, where Jesus is represented as possessing all the attributes of the pre-existent Son of Man (cf. Rev. i. 9–20), is worshipped by angels and men (v. 9–14), shares God's throne at the final consummation (xxi. 22–23, xxii. 1–3), and yet affirms of Himself: *I am the root and offspring of David, the bright, the morning star* (xxii. 16).

At this point the question insistently arises: How far was the transcendental conception of the Messiah prevalent among Jews in the Apostolic Age? That it exercised a profound influence on the Christology of the New Testament writers is obvious. It apparently supplied St. Paul, to a considerable extent, with the categories of his thought about the Christ, while it influenced the mind of our Lord Himself, as is shewn by His appropriation of the title '*Son of Man.*'[1] But in His hands the original conception was profoundly modified. In a startlingly original way He combined the idea of the glorious Heavenly Son of Man with that of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii.; the term as used by Christ includes both humiliation and glory, and this could not have been invented by any disciple or group of disciples; in the idea so modified, and embodied in the term *Son of Man*, Christ seems to have found the most adequate expression of His Messianic consciousness.

[1] There is no valid reason for doubting Christ's use of this term, as reflected in the Gospels.

Unquestionably the Christology of the Apostolic literature owes much to the mind of Christ Himself. Thus, for instance, the Johannine Apocalypse in its Christology combines the ideas of humiliation and glory, exactly as Christ Himself. But the question still remains : was there any antecedent knowledge on the part of the early disciples of the apocalyptic Son of Man ? Probably there was. What they found it so difficult to grasp was the idea of the Son of Man *suffering*. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the full doctrine of the Son of Man does not dominate the whole, or anything like the whole, of the Apocalyptic literature. Nor did the term *Son of Man* ever, so far as we can judge, become a popular designation of the Messiah. Perhaps the phenomena can best be explained by assuming that the home of this conception, in its developed form, lay outside Judæa ; it may have grown up in apocalyptic circles in Galilee.

While apocalpytic ideas no doubt pervaded Judæa, Pharisaism, which there had its stronghold, must have tended to keep them in check, to some extent. In Judæa the orthodox Rabbinic conception of the national Messiah, who was to spring from the family of David, prevailed. Perhaps some confirmation of this view is to be found in the evidence of John xii. 34, where ' the multitude ' (in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem) are represented as asking in surprise : " Who is this Son of Man ? " Probably, also, it was because the term had not become charged with too definite a content in the popular mind that Christ chose to use it as the symbol for expressing His own profoundly original conception.[1]

Some remarkable and significant theological conceptions

[1] Of course the term had a quite general meaning as ' man,' apart from its special Messianic use. It is constantly employed by Ezekiel in reference to himself, for instance.

of apocalyptic remain which must be noticed; but in the space that is available they can only be referred to very briefly.

Another example of the working of transcendental ideas is the apocalyptic picture of the Heavenly Jerusalem. It is only after the destruction of the Holy City in A.D. 70 that the conception of the pre-existent heavenly City (applied to Jerusalem) becomes clear and prominent in Jewish eschatology. It is described as having been created in the beginning of creation, and preserved by God in heaven. It is regarded as an actual city, with its own buildings and equipment, which, according to Revelation xxi. 1, descends from heaven bodily to the renovated earth, after the final Judgment.

Perhaps the clearest representation of the idea is given in *Ap. Bar.* iv. 2–6, where the seer is warned not to imagine that the ruins he sees before him (i.e. the earthly Jerusalem in ruins) is the city of which God said (Isa. xlix. 16): *On the palms of my hands have I graven thee; It* (sc. the heavenly City) *is that City which shall be revealed with me* (*God*), *that which was prepared beforehand here from the time when I took counsel to make Paradise and shewed it to Adam before he sinned, but when he transgressed the commandment it was removed from him, as also Paradise. And afterwards I shewed it to my servant Abraham among the portions of the victims* (cf. Gen. xv. 9–21). *And again also I shewed it to Moses on Mount Sinai, when I shewed to him the likeness of the tabernacle, and all its vessels, and behold it is preserved with me, as also Paradise.*

It is coupled here with the heavenly Paradise, and is destined to be revealed after the final Judgment, in the meanwhile being reserved by God in heaven; cf. also 4 Ezra x. 26 f., vii. 26, xiii. 36.[1]

[1] Cf. *The Ezra-Apocalypse* (ed. Box), p. 198 f.

We have already seen that apocalyptic sharply distinguishes between the present evil age (this age), and the future glorious age which is to succeed it (' the Age to come '). Here again transcendental ideas had by the first Christian century effected a radical transformation of the original conception. The old national Messianic hope is sublimated till it becomes almost entirely free from national associations, and in its place emerges the idea of a new order of being, realized in a transformed world-order, and conditioned by spiritual forces. The transition from the one to the other was, in the most developed form of apocalyptic thought, regarded as being *immediate*.

The present corrupt Age (symbolised by Esau) will be succeeded immediately, *without a break*, by the glorious future Age of incorruption (symbolised by Jacob). This seems to be the meaning of the allegorical passage in 4 Ezra vi. 7–10. Many passages shew that the apocalyptists believed they were standing at the end of the present corruptible Age, and that the critical moment, when the new life should dawn, was imminent. The present age has nearly reached its close (cf. 4 Ezra iv. 44–50, v. 51–55, *Ap. Bar.* lxxxv. 10), and when the end comes it will be by the act of the Creator alone (4 Ezra vi. 1–6).

The writer of the Salathiel section of 4 Ezra discards implicitly the older eschatology of the nation. He does not look forward to a restoration of the Jewish State, or a rebuilding of Jerusalem ; nor to a renewed and purified earth under the conditions of the present world-order. His hopes are fixed on the advent of the new and better world which will follow the collapse of the present world. Consequently he anticipates merely the catastrophic end of the present world-order—his theology does not allow of any intermediate Messianic Age. The new Jerusalem which is to come will be the heavenly City, which is shewn to Salathiel

in his final vision (4 Ezra x. 25 ff.). The Day of Judgment marks the division between the two Ages.

But the old national eschatology could not be finally eliminated in this summary way. Its hold upon tradition was too strong. Hence arose a curious compromise. The belief grew up that the present age would terminate with a *temporary* Messianic kingdom, the duration of which was variously estimated. In the Apocalypse of Ezra it is fixed at 400, and in the Johannine Apocalypse at 1,000 years (the Millennium). The fact that this earthly reign of the Messiah finds a place in the Book of Revelation at all shews that it had secured a firm place in the currently accepted Jewish eschatological scheme. "The idea of a temporary earthly consummation," says Prof. Porter, "followed by an eternal heavenly one, was, to the Jews, simply one of the ways of adjusting the new conceptions to the old, of providing for the literal fulfilment of Old Testament predictions and national ambitions, and yet giving a place, and the chief place, to the heightened and more supernatural expectations that had more lately arisen."[1] In the part of the Apocalypse of Ezra which refers to this matter (4 Ezra vii. 27 f.), which probably is the work of the final Redactor, the Messiah and all men are represented as dying, and rise again, after a week of years, with all souls—this resurrection being followed by the final Judgment and the coming in of the new age. The death of the Messiah in this way is unique in purely Jewish literature. Elsewhere, as in *Ap. Bar.*, the Messiah returns, at the end of his temporary reign, in glory to heaven. Though it would be precarious to assert that St. Paul believed in a millennium, the idea of the limited Messianic reign seems certainly to have influenced his eschatology, for according to 1 Cor. xv. 24–27 after Jesus, as the Messiah, "hath put all his enemies under his feet," He

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 278.

"shall deliver up" the Messianic kingdom to the Father, "that God may be all in all."

The currently received eschatology, as is well known, pictured the Messianic Age as being preceded by a time of 'travail,' called 'the birth-pangs' or 'sufferings' of the Messiah (T.B. *Shabbath*, 118b, cf. Matt. xxiv. 8, Mark xiii. 8), the idea being a deduction from certain passages in the Prophets (cf. Hos. xiii. 12 ff., Joel ii. 10 ff., Micah vii. 1–6). Many descriptions of these Messianic 'woes' are given in the apocalyptic and related literature; cf. e.g. *Jubilees* xx. 11–25, 1 Enoch xcix. 4 ff., 4 Ezra iv. 52–v. 12, vi. 24, etc., and in the New Testament Matt. xxiv. 6–20, Rev. vi.–ix. We need not linger on this well-known feature here.[1] An important moment in the eschatological drama is assigned to the great final conflict with the forces of the heathen nations, under the leadership of Gog and Magog, barbarian tribes of the north according to Ezekiel xxxviii.–xxxix. These hostile forces to the divine rule are destroyed by the Messiah (cf. 4 Ezra xiii. 34 ff.). The scene of the defeat of the evil powers is located in the mountains near Jerusalem, in the Johannine Apocalypse at Har Magedon (Armageddon).[2]

In this connexion it is important to refer to the place of Anti-Christ in the later eschatological system. The prototype of the Anti-Christ idea is probably to be found in the ancient myth of the terrible conflict waged with the Dragon of Chaos by the divine Hero. On the principle which plays so important a *rôle* in eschatological development that "Endzeit" = "Urzeit"—the last stage will reproduce the first—the transference of the idea of the mythical combat of the divine Hero with the primæval Dragon to the end of the ages is easy to understand. The conception thus arose

[1] Cf. *Rel. and Worship of Synagogue*, pp. 243 ff.

[2] For the 'wars of Gog and Magog' in the Johannine Apocalypse cf. Rev. xvi. 14, xx. 7–10.

of the battle of God (or His representative) with the Devil at the end of the world. "It is very likely," says Bousset, "that Anti-Christ is originally nothing else than the incarnate devil, and that the idea of a battle of God with a human opponent, in whom all devilish wickedness would become incarnate, arose under the influence of definite historical conditions." The first historical figure to be identified with Anti-Christ was the persecutor of the Jews, the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, whose lineaments are depicted in the Book of Daniel, and who became the type of the God-opposing tyrant. Later it was Nero. Later still, it was discovered now in this, now in that historical character. But it must not be forgotten that the political application of the idea, though it assumed a dominating place in the later development, was not an essential or original feature of the conception. Occasionally, as in 2 Thessalonians ii 3 f. ("the man of sin," "the son of perdition"), the Anti-Christ, freed from political associations, becomes a purely ideal figure which works in the spiritual sphere.

We have seen that Jesus, while He used the categories of apocalyptic thought, yet profoundly modified them in a startlingly original way. St. Paul also inherited the current apocalyptic ideas; but in common with other New Testament writers he radically modified what he had inherited by building his whole system on the historical career of Jesus. Thus the Apostle

agrees with certain aspects of the current Jewish Messianic hope in believing that the time immediately preceding the beginning of the Messianic Age—the last days of the primitive Church—that is to say the actual time in which Paul was living—was to be one of suffering and distress.[1] The coming of the Messianic age and judgment Paul certainly believed was to be soon.[2]

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29, x. 11, xv. 21, xvi. 22, 1 Thess. iv. 15, Phil. iv. 5.

[2] Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 1, 2. The citation is from Shailer Matthews, *Messianic Hope in N.T.* p. 166.

Dr. Shailer Matthews justly asserts that

> Paul shared largely in the eschatological Messianism of the apocalypses. When one comes to consider his views in detail it will appear that eschatology is really the centre of Pauline thought. He, like the Christians of Jerusalem, found the beginning of his Christian life in the conviction that Jesus was the Christ, destined to return from the world of spirits where he was already in supreme authority, to do the work of the expected eschatological Messiah upon the earth.[1]

In Jewish eschatology, as modified by Christian presuppositions, a dominant place is assigned to the Heavenly Messiah both at the Judgment, and in the future Age. Christ shares God's throne, and even when He gives up the Kingdom to the Father He remains the Head of the Redeemed and the object of their worship. But this supreme position assigned to the Christ was by no means a regular feature in Jewish Apocalyptic. Even in the Salathiel portion of the Apocalypse of Ezra the Judgment and the Kingship of the age to come are God's alone—no room is left for a mediatorial Christ (cf. 4 Ezra vi. 1 ff.). This also is characteristic of orthodox Rabbinic theology. The 'Kingdom of Heaven' means the rule of God. The national Davidic Messiah merely serves to prepare the way towards its accomplishment; the figure of the Messiah is in no wise essential.

Though Jewish Apocalyptic never entirely outgrew its

[1] *Op cit.* p. 169; cf. also the following: "Jesus was the personal Christ. He was in heaven (Rom. viii. 34), from which he was to come to bring salvation and to establish judgment. Therefore there would be a messianic reign (1 Cor. xv. 24–28)" (*op. cit.* p. 168). Schweitzer also has some pertinent remarks, one of which may be quoted here: "It is nothing less than astonishing," he says, "that the close affinities [of St. Paul's writings] with the Apocalypse of Ezra do not receive any recognition. In this work there are elaborate discussions of the problems of sin, the Fall of our first parents, Election, the wrath, long-suffering, and mercy of God, the prerogative of Israel, the significance of the Law, the temporal and the eternal Jerusalem, of the prospect of dying or surviving to the Parousia, the tribulation of the times of the End, and the Judgment." (*St. Paul and his Interpreters*, p. 51.)

national associations, it did indeed tend in the direction of a religious individualism. This, its logical goal, was most nearly attained in the Salathiel part of the Apocalypse of Ezra, which implicitly discards the old national eschatology.[1] It remained for the primitive Apostolic Church to work out the implications of the Apocalyptic view of things by bringing into clear prominence a purely religious individualism, entirely freed from national limitations.

G. H. Box.

## *THE UNIVERSAL CHRIST, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.*

### A Study of Colossians iii. 10 and 11.

The main argument of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians is meant to convince Christians that there are certain feelings and pursuits to which they must be dead, in the sense of having no capacity or inclination for them. Awakened by the inspiration of the risen Christ, they ought to be done with what formerly interested and influenced them. *Raised together with Christ . . . mortify your members which are upon the earth*—the interests, habits and affections which are characteristic of a selfish and sensual kind of life, that your spirits may soar after the ideals which the risen Christ has exalted before you.

What the Apostle would have his converts deny themselves to is fairly obvious. Indeed he sets it forth in detail. Everybody recognises that there are certain things unworthy in any man, and specially disgraceful in a Christian, such as insobriety and unchastity, deceit, greed and malice, a violent and peevish temper.

[1] Note too its profound interest in the fate of the individual soul after death (cf. 4 Ezra vii.).

But there is something more that we are not so ready to recognise as equally unworthy—indeed the source of most of the ill-feeling which we condemn—and that is the spirit which makes much of class distinctions, differences of race and social status. This has been, if not the whole, at any rate the chief cause of "man's inhumanity to man," which "makes countless thousands mourn." It has been the most effective disturber of the peace and goodwill which Christ came to promote among men, and has set nation against nation in sanguinary wars, and class against class with oppression and contempt on the one side, and hatred and rebellion on the other. Passionate protests have been uttered against this spirit of division, and strenuous efforts made to overcome it, as when Burns sang—

> "That man to man the world o'er
> Shall brothers be for a' that,"

or when the French Revolution attempted to inaugurate a new era of liberty, equality and fraternity. But neither poetic protests nor declarations, neither revolutions nor political systems will ever abolish the pernicious effects of class and racial distinctions. What is needed is a new spirit to inspire men to look at one another in a new light, and to treat one another in a new way. This St. Paul is indicating here. The new spirit had already begun to work marvellous results in the world as he knew it.

In our Lord's day there were far more bitter class antagonisms, far wider separations between peoples, societies and communities than we know in our modern world. There was the antagonism due to the different ideals of excellence and life that were cherished, on the one hand, by the Greek, with his art, literature and philosophy; and on the other hand, by the Jew, with his strict, legal system and stern religion. Closely connected with this was the religious antagonism between the uncircumcised Gentile, whom the

Jew despised as unclean and forgotten of God, and the circumcised Jew, whom the Gentile hated and ridiculed as a conceited fanatic. Then there was the national separation —largely one of culture and privilege—between the Greek and the Barbarian, and the ultra-savage Scythian, who was beyond the pale of all civilisation. But deeper, and more hopeless than any, in a society where slavery was an institution, was the social cleavage between freeman and bondman, the master and the slave.

In the Christian Church these distinctions were abolished, and the great gulfs fixed between nations and classes disappeared. Men and women came together in her communion, not as Jews and Greeks, barbarians, Scythians, slaves and freemen, not as mere men and women, but as brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ. It was not on the level of a common humanity they consorted, but in the fellowship of a common Christian experience. What had made them kin was that Christ was *all*—was everything, as we should say, to each one, and was *in all* of them. Christ had awakened new aspirations in them, and was satisfying and fulfilling these. They had put on the new man, which was being *renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him*, so that they saw themselves, and each other, and indeed all men, in a new light. Thus were overcome the antagonisms and divisions of the ancient world; and thus were evolved the fellowship and missionary zeal of the Christian Church, which began to fill the earth with peace and goodwill.

This blessed change implies two truths: (1) the Universality of Christ; and (2) the Brotherhood of Man.

## I.

By the Universality of Christ we mean that Christ is for every man of every nation, every time, and every rank, an

Ideal and a Saviour. He can, and does touch all sorts and conditions of men everywhere, and in all ages of the world's history, and prove Himself all in all to them. Every other teacher or guide of men has been the product of his own generation or people. But Christ is unique as He is universal. You need discount nothing, or allow for nothing in Him in order to understand Him, or feel His influence. Born in Bethlehem nineteen centuries ago, He lived in Galilee and Judea for some thirty-three years. During only three of them, as far as we can reckon, did He exercise a public ministry, and even then He restricted Himself to the people of Israel. Yet it seems almost absurd to connect any idea of nationality with Christ. He is so intensely and universally human : neither rank, nor even sex, has any relevance in our thoughts of Jesus. He is for every kindred and tribe, as He is for men and women alike, whatever their social standing or education. Nor have all these centuries dimmed the light of His teaching, or weakened the force of His authority and influence on us of to-day, or on the men of any age. He is for all time, as for all people. *Heaven and earth shall pass away*, He promised, *but My words shall not pass away.* And certainly time, which consumes all things, and covers with oblivion knowledge and prophecies, or renders them antiquated, " dry and exhaust," has left the teaching of Jesus as fresh and living to-day as when He first uttered it. *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.*

The reason for this unique appeal and universal influence is not far to seek. In the first place, Jesus has awakened the conscience of the race, and has held it with the true ideal for humanity. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, nor even male or female, because in Christ every one can see the kind of person God meant him to be, the kind of character he ought to

acquire and exhibit, the spirit that should animate his life. For Christ has taken our life and lived it Himself and has explained and enforced the ideal thus realised by all His teaching. It is not that we should all occupy the same position, use the same tools, fulfil the same functions, or take up the same work. The Jew and the Greek have each made their peculiar contribution to the heritage of the race, and we can afford to lose neither. All are not masters, nor need all be workmen. Men can never take the place of women, nor women the place of men, without stultifying themselves. But moral goodness does not vary with latitude and longitude, from age to age, or from sex to sex. Righteousness and holiness, charity, courage, patience and purity are the same for all. It is proof of the pre-eminence of Christ that He has awakened the conscience of all humanity to these truths, and that all humanity find without question their ideal of them in Him.

But further, not only is Christ the Ideal for all, but He is the Friend of all. From every people and land, in every age, and from every class, men have turned to Him to find, not only that He embodied what they should be, but that He understood them, their idiosyncrasies and infirmities, their difficulties, and could interpret them to themselves, as one who had passed through all and had overcome. He is the universal Sufferer, who was tempted in all points like as we are; and He is the universal Victor, for He was *yet without sin*.

And what can be the consequence but that He is the universal Saviour? An ideal for all, sympathising with all, living for and loving all, He can undertake, and can prevail for all in life and death to perfect them.

II.

To cherish that ideal which Christ has realised for us, to respond to His sympathy, and to prove, by committing ourselves to Him, His power to save—that is how we know the Brotherhood of Man, so that for us *in Christ Jesus there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ shall be all and in all.*

It is not the contemplation of mere humanity as it is (as in the popular line, " A man's a man for a' that ") that shall reconcile our differences, or abolish our social and racial separations. There is an instinct in all of us to get away from man as he is, to become something better, to rise higher. And so we take refuge in racial, social and religious distinctions. We clothe ourselves with names and ranks and professions, that the shame of our nakedness may not appear, and our native equality be hid. But to see in each other what man might be, what God would have him become, and what Christ became man to realise for him, that is to awake to the brotherhood of man, and to be drawn closer together. Let us cherish the Christ in ourselves, the Hope of Glory, and seek for and cherish the Christ in other men, or the possibility of Christ in them, and we shall know them as sons of our Father in heaven.

Thus do the distinctions of birth, and habit, and national ideal become unimportant. To find in any one, no matter what be his country, his language, or his colour, the same hopes that uplift you, the same spirit that animates you, and the same confidence that encourages you, is to find in him a brother. With such an one you could never be at war. You are at one with him in Christ.

Our religious differences are among the saddest and most hopeless that devastate humanity—the very travesty of a religion that should draw us together. The Churches are separated, and denounce each other, because of different

views and practices in certain particulars, or different forms of worship. But if we would only see the Christ in each other as the Hope of our common glory, Christ as the end to which we are all living, the end to which we are all working to realise Him in the world, how negligible all the points which divide the Churches would appear!

Then there is our western caste-system. Our social distinctions are perhaps the most embittering and estranging we know. Can we feel towards our servants and workpeople, or our employers and masters, as brethren? Can the educated and cultured look on the ignorant and boorish as their kith and kin? Or can the unlearned and uncultivated get over the pride and aloofness of such as are more fortunately placed, or their own shyness and awkwardness in their presence? Yes, if we have enough of the spirit of Christ in us to recognise in any one, how far so ever removed from us in social standing or culture, the soul that apprehends the glory of God's calling in Christ, the heart that believes in the love and grace of God in Christ. Thus shall we be drawn towards them and sympathise with them, because at one with them in Christ.

Nay, can we not look even on the degraded and outcast, the children of dirt and disease, neglect and vice, as brothers and sisters in Christ? Jesus hated and loathed vice and degradation, the sins and evil humours of men, with a purity of feeling, and denounced them with a power of invective, that are beyond us. But He loved all men and was not ashamed to call them brethren, because He saw in them the possibilities of the children of God, and He sympathised with them in their struggles and failures to attain. So He sacrificed Himself to save and help them.

To realise the true Brotherhood of Man is just to discern, even through rags and dirt and vice, that for which Christ

died, and for the sake of that, as for His sake, to do something to retrieve it.

It is not the "touch of nature" that shall really make "the whole world kin," but the touch of grace—the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

HUNTER SMITH.

## *THE HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.*

THIS story appears in Matthew viii. 5–13 and Luke vii. 1–10, and, in a slightly different form, in John iv. 46–54. It has been the general custom for scholars to say that it comes from the hypothetical document conveniently called "Q." This view has been held, among others, by Moffatt, Wendt, Hawkins, B. Weiss, Wellhausen, Johannes Weiss (with the exception of Luke vii. 4–6), Harnack and Stanton. Doubts have been raised by W. C. Allen, Oscar Holtzmann and Holdsworth. In spite of the general agreement upon the matter, strong arguments can be raised to prove that the story does not belong to "Q" at all, but is taken from the original Mark. It is the purpose of this essay to put forward those arguments.

(1) The first argument lies in the fact that the story also appears in the Fourth Gospel. This has been doubted by some, as, for example, Origen and Chrysostom in olden days, and Westcott and Plummer in their commentaries, and Zahn in his *Einleitung* in modern times. But ancient tradition is almost unanimous in its opinion that, in John, we have an adaptation of a Synoptic narrative. The resemblances are; (*a*) the cure is performed at a distance, (*b*) it is performed on a child, (*c*) the child belongs to a foreigner. The differences alleged by those who challenge the common source of the Synoptic and Johannine accounts are generally :

(*a*) In John, the miracle is performed at Cana; in the Synoptics at Capernaum. (*b*) In John, it is immediately after the return to Galilee; in the Synoptics, after some time has elapsed. (*c*) In John, it is a son who is cured; in the Synoptics it is a slave. (*d*) In John, the father is a Jew; in the Synoptics, he is a heathen. (*e*) In John, the faith of the father is weak; in the Synoptics, it is strong. (*f*) In John, Jesus refuses to go; in the Synoptics, He offers to go. Some of these differences do not hold, and if the others are pressed, it would be only fair to bring forward the differences in the two Synoptic accounts. It is hardly to the point to press chronology so far, seeing how uncertain we are regarding the general chronology of the Gospels. In John, certainly, the miracle, as is the case with everything else which he takes from the Synoptics, has received a different colouring and is recorded as a σημεῖον, and not as an instance of our Lord's human sympathy with suffering, although the fact must be remembered that this is the only miracle recorded in the Fourth Gospel, in which Jesus does not take the initiative. The question of the greatness of faith is rather subjective, and John uses the miracle to elicit the man's faith, and it gives him the chance to lead up to the kind of faith which Jesus required, which was to be found, not among Jews, but among the Samaritans and with this centurion. John uses υἱός, but although Luke has δοῦλος, Matthew has παῖς, which need not mean "servant," and Luke has παῖς in a later verse, which may mean δοῦλος, but which may equally well point to confusion between two accounts. In any case, the difference can be fully explained if the original source of all had παῖς. Matthew viii. 7 may not be an offer to go, but may be a question, "Am I to come and heal him?" (So Zahn and McNiele.) There is no warrant at all for saying that the man in John's account is a Jew. Matthew viii. 13

agrees with John iv. 52, and also Matthew and John agree in saying that the man came to Jesus himself, and did not merely send messengers. The importance of this will appear later. Meanwhile we assume that John is embodying a Synoptic story.

But can we say that John took the story from either Matthew or Luke? It is needless to emphasise the fact that critical study of the Fourth Gospel is destined to take on quite a new phase. We have left the days behind us when we could put John and the Synoptics in direct contradiction with each other. A minute examination of the Fourth Gospel shows that it was dependent, and largely dependent, upon Mark, and was written neither at first hand by an eyewitness nor merely out of the author's own head. But if we go on to try and prove that John knew Matthew and Luke, we are taking up a far more precarious position. The story of the centurion is practically the only point of any importance whatever in which Matthew and John agree as against Mark. This is almost tantamount to saying that John neither knew Matthew, nor had a source which he shared with Matthew. In the case of Luke, the position is far more difficult. Luke and John suggest in five instances at least that they had a common source. These instances are: (*a*) the anointing at Bethany, (*b*) the foot-washing in John, hinted at in Luke, "I am among you as one who serves," (*c*) the trial scenes, (*d*) the appearances of Jesus after the Resurrection as being in or near Jerusalem, with great likenesses over many of the details, (*e*) the appointment of Peter after the miraculous draught of fishes in Luke v. 1–11, and the rehabilitation of Peter after a miraculous draught of fishes in John xxi. The last instance will not count in our present argument, as it is taken for granted that John xxi. is an appendix, not coming from the author of the rest of the Gospel. In all the others we have

to bear in mind two important facts. First, they have to do with Jerusalem or its neighbourhood. Secondly, they all belong to the last week of the life of Jesus. In the case of the anointing Luke seems to have conflated two stories, one of which was derived from Mark, and one which he shared with John. In all the rest of the Gospels there is hardly a single trace that John either knew Luke or shared a source with Luke. And in the case of the common stories the linguistic likenesses are too few to prove that John knew Luke. It is simply a case of common oral tradition. But in the story of the centurion we have a relation referring to the early part of the ministry of Jesus, and Galilæan at that. Even if Luke does suggest more than one visit to Jerusalem, and so approximate to the Johannine outline of the life of Jesus, this might be derived from a common tradition belonging to Jerusalem. Thus we reach the conclusion that the only story which does not come from this common Jerusalemite source, or which does not come from Mark, is this story of the centurion. We must also remember the likenesses between Matthew and John, which seem to show that they drew the story from a common written source. This all raises the strong probability that that source was Mark.

(2) The second argument is derived from the contents of "Q." In so far as they can be reconstructed, they seem to bear out the statement of Papias that Matthew drew up the sayings of the Lord in the Hebrew language, *i.e.* in Aramaic. Any reconstruction of "Q" must be hypothetical for many reasons. There may have been many collections of the sayings of Jesus before the canonical Gospels, as men would be more interested in preserving them than in drawing up an account of His doings. Also we can never be certain that Matthew and Luke embody the whole of "Q," or have access to exactly the same collection. But the book of

sayings seems to have contained an account of the preaching, but no account of the travels and miracles of Jesus or of the Passion and Resurrection. Thus, "Q" could not have been a Gospel. Naturally the time and place of the sayings would be recorded, and perhaps also the interplay of question and answer. But the only real event which the majority of scholars allow in "Q" is the story of the centurion. This is the case with Moffatt, Wernle, Stanton, von Soden and others. In almost every other way they regard "Q" as a book of teaching. Why the story of the centurion should have a place in any such collection, it is hard to imagine. If the whole point were to be found in "Verily I tell you, I have not found such great faith, not even in Israel," one could understand it. All the rest might be merely the occasion to explain when and why Jesus said this. But this is not the main point of the story. The main point is the miracle. This is true even of the Fourth Gospel, even though the miracle was to increase the man's faith. But the atmosphere of "Q" is not the atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel. This again raises the feeling that we are not dealing with "Q."

(3) The two preceding arguments have tried to show the story cannot have come from "Q." What we have to do now is to prove that it could have belonged to Mark, and to show how it became separated from this Gospel. So far as I know, Oscar Holtzmann has given no explanation of the latter point. Holdsworth believes in a triple edition of Mark, and thinks the story was present in the second edition but was not put into the third. I fail to see how this solves the problem. You have to prove a triple edition of Mark first, and Mr. Holdsworth cannot be said to have done that. And even then you have to explain why the story had no place in the third edition, although it had one in the second. That being so, we must seek for

another explanation. It is almost certain that we do not possess Mark in its original form. Some of the Gospel has been lost (*e.g.* the conclusion). Some parts of the present Gospel may be additions (*e.g.* i. 2–3). If one part has been lost, a second part could also quite easily be lost, and that after it had been used by the other evangelists. We have in the *pericope adulterae* in John vii. 53–viii. 11 an example of a lost page of a manuscript which has been fitted into more than one place. In Dr. Souter's text of the New Testament this pericope takes up sixteen and a half lines. Matthew viii. 5–13, and Luke vii. 1–10, each take up just over sixteen lines. It is therefore quite possible that the story in Mark took up much the same space, and that the page has been lost. In John the story takes up much less space, but that does not affect the question very much. John does not deal as faithfully with Mark as do Matthew and Luke. If we assume, therefore, that this page has been lost from between Mark i. 45 and ii. 1, it seems to relieve us of a few difficulties. Mark i. 45 says that Jesus could not go openly into a city, because the cure of the man with leprosy had been noised abroad. He therefore remained in the desert and people came out to Him there. This is embodied substantially in Luke, and it causes no difficulty because the account of the centurion is put much later. Matthew, on the other hand, omits Mark i. 45 because, apparently, it does not suit the context. Jesus is about to enter into Capernaum. Also λόγος is ambiguous, and Matthew may be influenced by the desire to cover up the man's disobedience (cf. Matt. xiii. 58, Mark vi. 48, ix. 30, vi. 24). Both Matthew and Luke say the miracle was performed in Capernaum. John says it happened at Cana. The differences can be explained partly if the miracle was performed outside Capernaum and was the reason why Jesus entered into the city. But, immediately

after recording that Jesus could not enter into Capernaum, Mark goes on to say that he did actually enter into this city. The reason of this may perhaps be found in the request of the centurion that Jesus should go and heal his son. It is quite possible, under certain circumstances, that Jesus could change His mind. He does, for example, in the case of the healing of the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman. The Fourth Gospel in vii. 1–13 also says He changed His mind with regard to a visit to Jerusalem. And to find this in the Fourth Gospel is strong evidence that it is an account of what really happened. It can be suggested, therefore, that Jesus went back into Capernaum to heal the servant. Upon arriving in the city, He was met either by the centurion or his messengers, with the result that the servant was healed without Jesus going to the house. This explains how the story could assume two forms, in which the miracle was performed in Capernaum (as with Luke and Matthew), and outside Capernaum (as with John).

H. J. Flowers.

# INDEX.


PAGE

**Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., Litt.D.**
Wrath "unto the Uttermost" . . . . . 356

**Rev. A. E. Baker, M.A.**
The Parables and the Johannine Problem . . . 305

**Rev. W. Ernest Beet, Litt.D., F.R.Hist.S.**
The Message of the Book of Job . . . . . 111

**Rev. Canon G. H. Box, M.A., D.D.**
Jewish Apocalyptic in the Apostolic Age . . 321, 437

**Professor Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D.**
The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface . . . 401

**Rev. James Robertson Cameron, M.A., D.Phil.**
Some Notes on the Development of Jesus . . 267, 388

**Professor W. A. Craigie, LL.D., Litt.D.**
The Beginning of St. Mark's Gospel . . . . 303

**Rev. J. M. Creed, M.A.**
Some Recent Tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels. 241

**Rev. Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D.**
The Letter of Zoilos . . . . . 420

**Rev. George Edmundson, D.Litt.**
The Date of the Shepherd of Hermas . . . . 161

**Rev. Professor J. W. Falconer, D.D.**
The Temptation . . . . . 177

**Rev. A. Fawkes, M.A.**
Antonio Fogazzaro . . . . . 377

**Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A.**
The Fatherhood of God. . . . . 52
The Failure of Government . . . . . 316

**H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D.**
The Healing of the Centurion's Servant . . . . 466

**Professor Rendel Harris, LL.D., Litt.D.**
Artificial Variants in the Text of the New Testament. . 254

PAGE

Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.
The Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-Realisation of Christ 135

Rev. Professor J. A. Kelso, Ph.D., D.D.
The Water Libation in the Old Testament . . . 226

Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D.
The Ferguson Heresy Case: a Page in Scottish Church History 282

Rev. Professor W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.
The Call of Amos . . . . . 45

Rev. Innes Logan, M.A.
A Sometimes Neglected Factor Illustrated . . . 75

Rev. G. H. C. MacGregor, M.A.
How Far is the Fourth Gospel a Unity? . . . 81

Rev. Professor John R. Mackay, M.A.
Benjamin B. Warfield: A Bibliography . . . 26

Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
The Knowledge of God Mediated by Forgiveness . . 60

Rev. A. D. Martin, M.A.
The Sign of Jonah . . . . . 151

Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
St. Luke and Literary Criticism . . . . . 1

Rev. J. R. Mozley, M.A.
John Theodore Merz . . . . . 18

Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D.
The Golden Calf . . . . . 121

Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., Litt.D.
A New Turn in Johannine Criticism . . . . 346

Rev. Professor J. A. Robertson, M.A., D.D.
What is now Meant by the Authority of Scripture? . 212

Rev. Professor J. A. Robertson, M.A., D.D., and Edith Anne Robertson.
The Baptism of Christ . . . . . 262
Jesus' Preaching in Capernaum . . . . . 430

Rev. Hunter Smith, M.A.
The Universal Christ and the Brotherhood of Man . . 459

Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.
The "Men" of the North . . . . . 189

# INDEX TO SUBJECTS.


PAGE

A Sometimes Neglected Factor Illustrated . . . . . 75
Amos, The Call of . . . . . 45
Antonio Fogazzaro . . . . . 377
Apostolic Age, Jewish Apocalyptic in the . . . . . 321, 437
Artificial Variants in the Text of the New Testament . . . . 254
Authority of Scripture, What is now meant by . . . . . 212
Baptism of Christ, The. . . . . 262
Beginning of St. Mark's Gospel, The . . . . . 303
Brotherhood of Man, The Universal Christ and the . . . . . 459
Capernaum, Jesus' Preaching in . 430
Centurion's Servant, The Healing of the . . . . . 466
Date of the Shepherd of Hermas, The . . . . . 161
Development of Jesus, Some Notes on the . . . . . 267, 388
Failure of Government, The . . 316
Fatherhood of God, The . . . 52
Ferguson Heresy Case: A Page in Scottish History . . . . . 282
Fogazzaro, Antonio. . . . . 377
Forgiveness, The Knowledge of God mediated by. . . . . 60
Fourth Gospel, How Far is it a Unity? . . . . . 81
Golden Calf, The . . . . . 121
Gospels, Recent Tendencies in the Criticism of the . . . . . 241
Healing of the Centurion's Servant, The . . . . . 466
Jesus' Preaching in Capernaum . 430
Jewish Apocalyptic in the Apostolic Age . . . . . 321, 437
Job, The Message of the Book of . 111
Johannine Criticism, A New Turn in 346
Johannine Problem, The Parables and the . . . . . 305

PAGE

Jonah, The Sign of . . . . . 151
Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface, The . . . . . 401
Knowledge of God Mediated by Forgiveness, The . . . . 60
Letter of Zoilos, The . . . . 420
Literary Criticism, St. Luke and. 1
"Men" of the North, The . . 189
Message of the Book of Job, The 111
Merz, John Theodore . . . . 18
New Testament, Artificial Variants in the Text of the . . . . 254
New Turn in Johannine Criticism, A . . . . . 346
Old Testament, The Water Libation in the . . . . . 226
Parables and the Johannine Problem, The . . . . . 305
Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-Realisation of Christ, The 135
St. Luke and Literary Criticism . 1
St. Mark's Gospel, The Beginning of . . . . . 303
Scripture, The Authority of . . 212
Shepherd of Hermas, The Date of the . . . . . 161
Sign of Jonah, The . . . . . 151
Some Notes on the Development of Jesus . . . . . 267, 388
Some Recent Tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels . . 241
Temptation, The . . . . . 177
Universal Christ and the Brotherhood of Man, The . . . . 459
Warfield, Benjamin B.: A Bibliography. . . . . 26
Water Libation in the Old Testament, The. . . . . 226
What is now meant by the Authority of Scripture? . . . . 212
Wrath "unto the Uttermost" . 356
Zoilos, The Letter of . . . . 420

# INDEX TO TEXTS.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Exod. xxxii. | 121 |
| Ezra viii. 20 ff. | 439 |
| Job iii. 24 | 240 |
| xix. 25–27 | 113 |
| Ps. xxii. 14 | 240 |
| Isa. xxv. 8 | 442 |
| xxvi. 14 | 442 |
| lvii. 15 | 439 |
| Lam. ii. 2 | 239 |
| ii. 19 | 238 |
| Ezek. xxxiv. | 316 |
| Amos iii. 2 | 280 |
| v. 18–20 | 280 |
| vii. 15 | 45, 49, 279 |
| Jonah i. 4 | 155 |
| Zech. xiii. 4 | 388 |
| xiv. 16, 17 | 231 |
| Matt. iii. 2. | 390 |
| iii. 11 | 395 |
| iv. 48 | 144 |
| xi. 11 | 278 |
| xi. 19 | 388 |
| xi. 27 | 146 |
| xii. 38–42 | 151 |
| xxi. 32 | 395 |
| Mark i. 4 | 390 |
| i. 7, 8 | 395 |
| i. 27 | 270 |
| i. 41. | 259 |
| Mark iii. 21 | 271 |
| xiv. 71 | 3 |
| Luke i. 80 | 279 |
| iii. 3. | 390 |
| iii. 15 | 395 |
| iii. 16 | 395 |
| iii. 17 | 399 |
| xi. 29–32 | 151 |
| xiv. 26 | 101, 272 |
| xx. 40 | 3 |
| xxii. 59 | 3 |
| John i. 16 | 144 |
| i. 27 | 395 |
| ii. 1 | 76 |
| iii. 13 | 450 |
| iv. 51 | 76 |
| viii. 23 | 157 |
| x. 24 | 110 |
| xv. 5 | 143 |
| xv. 11 | 144 |
| xv. 26, 27 | 91 |
| xvii. 4 | 146 |
| xx. 17 | 108 |
| xx. 22 | 92 |
| Rom. viii. 15 | 276 |
| xii. 5 | 137 |
| 1 Cor. xi. 13 | 137 |
| xii. 12 | 137, 139 |
| xii. 27 | 136 |
| 1 Cor. xv. 28 | 140, 146 |
| xv. 42 | 139 |
| 2 Cor. xi. 2 | 142 |
| Gal. i. 14 | 270 |
| iv. 6 | 276 |
| Eph. i. 23 | 135 |
| ii. 5, 6 | 140 |
| iii. 19 | 143, 144 |
| iv. 13 | 143 |
| iv. 15 | 147 |
| iv. 16 | 141 |
| iv. 25 f. | 142 |
| Phil. i. 11 | 145 |
| i. 23 | 146 |
| ii. 11 | 146 |
| iii. 21 | 145 |
| Col. i. 15 | 139 |
| i. 19 | 146 |
| i. 22 | 141 |
| ii. 3 | 145 |
| ii. 9 | 143, 144 |
| ii. 10–19 | 141 |
| iii. 3 | 140 |
| iii. 10 | 139 |
| iii. 10, 11 | 459 |
| iii. 11 | 137, 139, 140 |
| iii. 19 | 144 |
| Rev. xxii. 16 | 451 |


Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner, Frome and London

GTU Library
3 2400 00276 5737

.8
4
2:2

Expositor

THREE DAY

| DATE | ISSUED TO |
| --- | --- |
| 2 1991 | Penrod DEC 97 - 5 1997 |

Ser 8
V. 24
1922:2
Expositor

HIGHSMITH #42-[illegible] U.S.A.